

FIRST CORINTHIANS

A Contemporary Commentary

by

GORDON H. CLARK

The Trinity Foundation
Jefferson, Maryland

Cover: *So He Drove the Man Out*
by Stephen Gjerison, American, born 1949, oil
on paper mounted to board, 47x38%, 1982
Collection Jill Worre

Copyright 1975
Lois A. Zeller and Elizabeth Clark George
Second edition, copyright 1991
The Trinity Foundation
Post Office Box 700
Jefferson, Maryland 21755

ISBN: 0-940931-29-X

CONTENTS

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----|
| Foreword | iv |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Chapter One | 9 |
| Chapter Two | 128 |
| Chapter Three | 159 |
| Chapter Four | 168 |
| Chapter Five | 177 |
| Chapter Six | 186 |
| Chapter Seven | 195 |
| Chapter Eight | 126 |
| Chapter Nine | 139 |
| Chapter Ten | 151 |
| Chapter Eleven | 168 |
| Chapter Twelve | 189 |
| Chapter Thirteen | 203 |
| Chapter Fourteen | 218 |
| Chapter Fifteen | 250 |
| Chapter Sixteen | 316 |
| Scripture Index | 323 |
| Index | 331 |
| The Crisis of Our Time | 351 |
| Intellectual Ammunition | 359 |

Books by Gordon H. Clark

- Readings in Ethics* (1931)
Selections from Hellenistic Philosophy (1940)
A History of Philosophy (coauthor, 1941)
A Christian Philosophy of Education (1946, 1988)
A Christian View of Men and Things (1952)
What Presbyterians Believe (1956)¹
Thales to Dewey (1957, 1989)
Dewey (1960)
Religion, Reason and Revelation (1961, 1986)
William James (1963)
Karl Barth's Theological Method (1963)
The Philosophy of Science and Belief in God (1964, 1987)
What Do Presbyterians Believe? (1965, 1985)
Peter Speaks Today (1967)²
The Philosophy of Gordon H. Clark (1968)
Biblical Predestination (1969)³
Historiography: Secular and Religious (1971)
If Peter (1972)⁴
The Johannine Logos (1972, 1989)
Three Types of Religious Philosophy (1973, 1989)
Romans (1975, 1991)
Colossians (1979, 1989)
Predestination in the Old Testament (1979)⁵
I and If Peter (1980)
Language and Theology (1980)
First John (1980)
God's Hammer: The Bible and Its Critics (1982, 1987)
Behaviorism and Christianity (1982)
Faith and Saving Faith (1983, 1990)
In Defense of Theology (1984)
The Pastoral Epistles (1984)
The Biblical Doctrine of Man (1984)
The Trinity (1985, 1990)
Logic (1985, 1988)
Ephesians (1985)
Clark Speaks From the Grave (1986)
Logical Criticisms of Textual Criticism (1986, 1990)
First and Second Thessalonians (1986)
Predestination (1987)
The Atonement (1987)
The Incarnation (1988)
Today's Evangelists: Counterfeits or Genuine? (1990)

¹ Revised in 1985 as *What Do Presbyterians Believe?*

² Combined in 1980 as *I & If Peter*.

³ Combined in 1987 as *Predestination*.

FOREWORD

In some of his letters to the churches Paul briefly warns against man-made philosophy; in I Corinthians he spends the better part of three chapters emphasizing the point: God has made the wisdom of this world foolishness.

It is disappointing that many Christians have not understood Paul's argument and a tragedy that they have rejected his conclusion. It seems to be an occupational hazard—perhaps besetting sin would be the better phrase—of Christian philosophers and theologians that they try to incorporate the wisdom of this world—the current conclusions of science, the arguments of natural theology, the speculations of psychologists and counselors, to name three favorites—into Scripture. How much time and effort could be saved were every Christian college student to understand what Paul is saying in the opening chapters of I Corinthians.

Gordon Clark was an unusual thinker in that he did understand and agree with Paul's argument and conclusion: The wisdom of this world is indeed foolishness. If we wish true wisdom, if we desire knowledge, we must search the Scriptures, for they alone are the oracles of God. In this commentary, Clark continues his magnificent and lifelong effort at bringing all thought into captivity to Christ. The attentive and thoughtful reader will learn a great deal in the next three hundred pages. None of it, needless to say, will be the conclusions of science, psychology, or human philosophy. It will be Wisdom, the Wisdom mentioned by Solomon and John; the Wisdom that framed the worlds and guides souls to Heaven.

John W. Robbins
 October 28, 1990

INTRODUCTION

This book aims to help two groups of Christians. First, there are those who study privately, by themselves, "on their own." Having no other teacher, like the Ethiopian eunuch, they need all the help they can get. Second, there are persons who are enrolled in and benefit from Bible classes. The teacher of such classes needs textbooks. Every three or six months, he tries to answer the question, What shall we use next? There are all too few suitable textbooks. The present writer hopes that this one will be a useful addition.

However, more important than stating what groups are to be helped is the quality of what help is here offered. The title, of course, indicates that this is a study book on First Corinthians, but what is its plan and procedure? Obviously, the aim is to explain the main message of the epistle—but how much will be included, and what will be omitted?

A standard full length commentary examines every word of the text and brings to bear upon it all the relevant material, and maybe some irrelevant, that the author can amass. One such commentary, which the present writer has read in preparation for what follows, was written by Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer. It is a tome as ponderous as his German name. For 406 pages, 6 x 8½ inches, of rather dense print, Meyer tried to write a commentary for all time. He succeeded reasonably well. For professional scholars, his work is indispensable. Naturally it is loaded down, not only with the Greek of the text, but also with quotations from the early fathers, also in Greek; and from later commentaries in Latin. Most of those who will read the book in hand do not want such abundance.

A knowledge of Greek is not to be disparaged, however. God chose it for His revelation. Every serious Christian, in

this author's opinion, ought to know at least the Greek alphabet. It hardly takes a half an hour. With this minimal knowledge one can at least see that two words, different in English, are the same word in Greek; or two the same in English are different in Greek. This minimal knowledge will enable the student to recognize what the commentary is referring to, and will prevent a good deal of confusion.

Nor would I recommend that a knowledge of Greek be restricted to a minimum. Permit a reference to family history. My father was a minister, a college and seminary graduate, with further study in Edinburgh. His father was also a well educated minister. However, my mother's father earned his meager living as a humble wool carder. After retirement, he began to study Greek; and in his Greek Testament, where he recorded his progress, I can see the small number of verses he was able to cover night by night. He wrote no commentaries, but he greatly extended his knowledge as well as his love of the New Testament. Few people, unfortunately, will follow his example, for it takes about a year of daily study to reach the first level of proficiency.

With a twinge of conscience, the present book does not use Greek—at least it does not use the Greek alphabet. Some words are transliterated. Seminary students can easily recognize what they come from. There is also a certain amount of textual criticism. Again, this will be helpful to the seminary students; but it is also the author's decided opinion that every Christian who has two and a half brain cells should know that there is such a thing as textual criticism and should have examined one or two instances. The ordinary Christian will not become expert in it. Few seminary students become expert in textual criticism. However, there is no good reason for remaining totally ignorant when a little of it is now here in your hands. There are also other difficulties in studying the New Testament. Do not groan if some of the details are tedious. Remember that Meyer wrote 406 pages of fine print. Do not object to a discussion of rejected interpre-

tations. These increase one's understanding of the text. To see what Paul did not mean clarifies what he did mean. If a Bible student has a real love for God's Word, as Jacob loved Rachel, seven years of study will seem but an evening's delight.

The difficulties in First Corinthians come in several sizes. First, there are passages which as a whole are puzzling. For example, what implications concerning American university education, or for education in general, can be drawn from I Corinthians 1:19-2:16? Presbyterians have historically insisted on an educated ministry; but the Cumberland church and other denominations thought that any willing frontiersman could preach. Slightly less in size is the question whether chapter seven condemns, approves of, or merely condones slavery. Here, too, there are implications relative to the activism, radicalism, vandalism, and general savagery of recent college students. Again, does chapter fifteen teach premillennialism, rule it out, or leave it in doubt?

The same chapter discusses the resurrection of the body. What will our future life be like? Does the marriage relation continue? Shall we eat Delmonico steaks? Will we need haircuts? Do we spend our time studying Greek and playing Bach on the harpsichord? Some of these questions are answered, by implication, in that chapter.

Before we can make progress toward answering these interesting and contemporary questions, we must see precisely what the verses say. This is not always easy. In fact, this epistle is a rather difficult one. Therefore, this may be a good place to outline a procedure for study. Read verses one and two and ask, Does the phrase "believe in vain" contradict the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints? Read verses three and four and ask, Is this the indispensable minimum of Christian doctrine? How did Paul get this information? What is the significance of these verses for apostolic history, in other words, the development of Christianity in the first century? What is the significance of the phrase "according to the Scrip-

tures" in verses three and four? What is the implication of "the third day" for existentializing or demythologizing the New Testament? Further on, read verses 25 through 28 and ask, Is Christ inferior to the Father? What about the Trinity? Do these verses teach universal salvation? It is by considering such questions that one comes to a better understanding of what Paul actually said.

In other places, there are difficulties which, though real, are too insignificant to be of great value. Such are omitted here, yet some readers may think there are still too many fine points included. Two extremes should be avoided: a person misses a great deal if he cannot see the forest for the trees; but he also misses a great deal if he cannot see the trees, and even some of the leaves. After all, the difference between aspen leaves and pine needles is worth noting.

There is another type of difficulty. The wording of a passage may be grammatically and superficially clear, while at the same time, the argument and its relation to other parts of Scripture need careful study. For example, does chapter eight contradict most of II Peter? Or, again, in a series of reasons—and Paul often enough says *because* three times in a row—what is a reason for what? Not all scholars agree. In those cases, even with all the commentaries now in existence, the reflections of an additional exegete might possibly be of some help.

There are indeed a great many commentaries in existence. One of the most recent is that of E. M. Robertson (Macmillan, 1973). The author is clearly a liberal with a poor opinion of Paul. In his first two chapters, he accuses Paul of jealousy and imagines an unpleasant relationship between Paul and Apollos: "Paul was not going to let Apollos get away with it all" (p. 30). Nothing in the text supports this ungenerous view.

Other commentaries show more respect and better judgment. This is true even of Geoffrey B. Wilson's little paperback (*The Banner of Truth Trust*, 1971). In it, the author

includes a few of his own thoughts; but the bulk of the book consists of disjointed quotations from a dozen or so other commentators. Respectful of Paul, the quotations certainly are; but the lack of originality and the lack of system in compiling them produce a chaos in which Paul's message is not very distinctly delineated.

In a brief list of commentaries one ought to mention the names of Ellicott, Lightfoot, Lange, Lenski, Grosheide, and others referred to in the present book. They all have some good points, and grateful credit will be given them as deserved. Of course, they all have flaws too. The present book, since its author is also human, has its own. In contrast with Wilson's, maybe this one is too original, but the writer opines he has seen and discusses a few difficulties the others missed.

Perhaps a Roman Catholic commentary should be mentioned: *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1953), in which W. Rens has eighteen pages of two columns each of fine print. Expectedly Romish in its viewpoint (and this should be of interest to Protestants), it nonetheless gives good explanations of many passages. However, it is not a verse by verse commentary. Rather, it is made up of summaries of sections. Its brevity necessitates many omissions.

Not everything is discussed in this book either; and there is some unevenness in the length of the discussions. These choices, which every author must make, are matters of judgment and are to some extent arbitrary.

If anyone fear that too many verses or words are left undiscussed, and that disturbing gaps impede the understanding, let it be said at least that the present volume does not skip from chapter one, verse six to chapter four, verse twelve, and then to chapter seven, verse five. True, some minor matters are omitted, and some things only briefly referred to, but the context is quite sufficiently continuous to follow the main argument from beginning to end.

In particular, let one note that the translation is, itself, a

sort of commentary. If the meaning of a given Greek word is in dispute, and if the point is not of great importance, the translation will show the present writer's choice. However, even when the discussion is lengthy, the translation must be taken as part of the commentary and compared with all the other translations the reader can obtain.

There is another area of personal choice—one that lends itself to expansion rather than contraction. It has to do with quotations. Some previous commentators, whose books are often difficult to find, have made unusually valuable contributions at certain points and deserve to be quoted. Not only do they deserve the honor; the reader deserves the assistance. No present-day author can possibly be one hundred percent original. Anything even ninety percent original would have to be incredibly bad. However, how much good material should be quoted can only be the author's choice.

So much for the method of construction to be followed. Two other remarks will conclude the preparation for this study. The first has to do with the character of the epistle.

Everyone knows (is it not so?) that Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians is not a doctrinal epistle as is Romans, but that it centers its attention on practical congregational troubles in Corinth. Nearly everyone knows or believes that Paul's instructions must be of some help to disturbed congregations today. Though American churches of the twentieth century do not face precisely the same problems, for here no one is touchy about eating hamburger that has been offered to idols, the principles Paul expounded in resolving that ancient matter of contention are still applicable. Indeed, the "impending distress" that Paul mentions in chapter seven has been and is, in this twentieth century, an all too real predicament in some countries, and cannot be considered impossible in the near future even in America. Consequently, Paul's advice on how to avoid unnecessary misery in times of persecution is pertinent now.

The reader will soon note, however, that Paul solves his

practical problems on theological principles. This is why his words are applicable today. Had he used an *ad hoc* procedure, his advice would have gone out of date centuries ago. Since he bases his instruction on universal propositions, and divinely revealed propositions at that, it never grows old or becomes useless.

An *ad hoc*, or even a systematic nondoctrinal ethics can never be Christian. Christian practice is the practice of Christian doctrine, *Philosophia Bion Kubernētēs*, in the way chapter two explains. For this reason, many so-called devotional books; thin not merely in quantity but in quality as well, if they are of use to the very immature babes in Christ, are no longer of much use to the officers who must bear the responsibility of administering a congregation. They are of even less use to those who must teach prospective officers.

There are degrees of maturity among Christians. Different types of books are needed. Speaking reverently, some things God has said are *relatively* unimportant; that is, relative to the task at hand. The genealogies of First Chronicles are relatively unimportant in studying the major doctrines of revelation. Paul's teaching on divorce is unimportant where no one is contemplating divorce. Or, more obviously, murder is more serious than theft. The present book is addressed, not to professional scholars, not to babes who cannot eat any solid food, but to people in the large middle-group who are seriously interested in divine revelation and in congregational problems.

The second and final remark concerns the method of studying this book. The most important advice to make the reading of this commentary profitable is: Always keep your Bible open before you. To be sure, the scriptural words are translated, quoted, and sometimes repeated. Pay attention to these translations. Nevertheless, with all attention to the translations, most students are likely to lose their way every so often unless they keep their Bibles open in front of them.

The main reason for this is, of course, that when the

interpretative discussion runs over to the following page, the translation is no longer before the reader's eyes. Another reason is that a necessarily detailed explanation of a difficult phrase tends to distract the reader from the continuous argument. He focuses on the pine needle and misses the ponderosa. The love of Scripture, however, leads to an examination of every single word. Strip a ponderosa of its needles and the glory has departed. Both the tree and the needles are necessary, yet style forbids a commentary from repeating a phrase twelve times on two pages. Because college students are so forgetful (I have taught them for almost fifty years), professors sometimes write the main idea on the blackboard. Since there is no blackboard in this situation, the advice is, if you wish to follow the argument, keep your Bible open, and may the Holy Spirit lead you into all truth.

I

1. Pauline epistles regularly begin with three particulars: the signature of the writer, the address or addressees, and a greeting. Here Paul attaches to his signature the title of apostle. This is not unusual, but the first word after his name is not *apostle*; it is *called*.

The introduction above said that this epistle is a practical epistle based on doctrine. Doctrine begins with this second word. In fact, in the first two verses, Paul refers to the doctrine of election four times: (1) Paul is called, (2) by the will of God, (3) and addresses those called out [the church], who are themselves called, (4) and the theme carries on to verse nine where again Paul says that the Corinthians were called, chosen, or elected by God. Doubtless there is a slight difference between the notion of election and the idea of calling. God called Paul. In history, this call occurred on the road to Damascus; but in eternity, God had decided or chosen to call Paul. This eternal choice is named election. The event in time, consequent upon the divine choice, is the call.

Since this idea is mentioned four times in two verses, it is a repetition that should not be ignored. Compare other epistles. Romans 1:1 says that Paul is an apostle by the will of God. Galatians 2:15 states that it was the good pleasure of God, the divine initiative, that separated him [for the apostleship] from his birth, and called him [on the road to Damascus]. See also the other epistles.

Sosthenes joins Paul in sending this letter to the Corinthians. These Corinthians have been sanctified by Christ and are "called holy," or "called saints." This does not mean that people generally called them saints. The pagan community probably called them insane. Therefore, a better translation is, "called, saints"; or with a little interpretation "called to be

saints." In any case, God chose them and gave them the title of saints. This obviously does not mean that all the Corinthians, or any of them, were subjectively holy in the sense of no longer sinning. The following chapters reprimand them severely for their gross sins. However, the Corinthian Christians were set apart by God; He had elected them to be holy; they would certainly make progress in this life; and at the predetermined time, God will make them subjectively and perfectly sinless.

The point is important for the interpretation of other verses that use similar phrases. Americans of the twentieth century are likely to attach extremely idealistic meanings to the words *holy* and *saint*. There is also the word *perfect* that will be found later. The idealistic misunderstanding of such terms will result in distortions of Paul's doctrine. One must remember that for Paul every Christian is a saint. A perfect or sinless life is no more a prerequisite for this title than a canonization ceremony.

If this epistle in a narrower sense is addressed to the Corinthians, there is a wider sense in which it is addressed to or applicable to "all who call on the name of the Lord in every place." No doubt this implies that the admonitions to be given are valuable for twentieth century Christians too; but it is possible that Paul had immediately in mind, not every place in the world, but every place in Greece. II Corinthians 1:1, similar in wording, specifies all of Greece. However Paul thought of it, the contents of the letter are normative for all Christians who face the same situations.

4 "I constantly thank my God concerning you for the grace of God given to you by Jesus Christ."

In the United States, some Christians sing,

Count your many blessings
Name them one by one. . . .

How many of us thank God for having blessed other people?

Count your neighbors' blessings
And it may surprise you
What the Lord hath done.

God gave the Corinthians grace by Jesus Christ. Of course, grace has to be given. Unmerited favor is not a product manufactured by man. The Christian is not born of his earthly parents, nor of the will of the flesh, in other words, human nature, nor of his own individual will, but of God. Later in the epistle the idea of free grace becomes the basis of some exhortations. Thus, the doctrine of grace is a foundation for practice.

1:5-6 Continuing the same sentence: "... because in every respect you were enriched by him in all doctrine and all knowledge. . . ." These two points need discussion: (1) the translation of the word *logos*, and (2) the role of knowledge. If we discover the sense of the verse on point (2), it will help the translation of point (1).

To make progress on the second point, one needs a little knowledge of English, which we all have; then a Greek lexicon will help even those who know no more than the Greek alphabet; and finally, the inferences made must be validly drawn. F. W. Grosheide (*Commentary*, Eerdmans, 1953) writes, "The Greek word [*gnōsis*] has a less intellectual flavor than the English. Knowledge as it is used here may be the fruit of intuition, even of a mystic feeling. At least it is not exclusively the result of research or thinking, but is an insight into things" (p. 28). Now, it can hardly be maintained that *knowledge* in English is always strictly intellectual; nor can it be maintained that *gnōsis* in Greek is less so. Both languages use the term in a variety of ways. In fact, *knowledge* may be "less intellectual" than *gnōsis*. The great heresy of the second century was *gnosticism*; but this *gnōsis* had for its content a more or less, and rather more, complicated scheme of cosmology. Nobody today believes that these cosmological theories are true; but what are they if not "intellectual"?

Furthermore, to argue that *gnōsis* is less intellectual because "it may be the fruit of intuition" causes one to wonder what "intuition" is. Without commending James McCosh and his *Intuitions of the Mind*, but using it only as evidence of

English usage, one notes that these intuitions are our knowledge of body, matter, spirit, number, motion, time, space; and a list of relational concepts. Are these not intellectual? For Kant, intuitions are time and space (pure intuitions), and this chair, that dog, the tree here, and the house over there (empirical intuitions). Beyond both these schools of philosophy, and condemned by both, are those who reject all empirical intuitions and assert intellectual intuitions of abstract principles. To call something intuitional therefore does not deny that it is intellectual.

As for Grosheide's supposition that *gnōsis* can mean "mystic feeling," Liddell and Scott's great lexicon gives no such hint. Arndt and Gingrich says, "Although here *gnōsis* and *sophia* are almost synonyms; Paul distinguishes between them in I Corinthians 12:8; he places *gnōsis* between *apokalypsis* and *propheteia* (14:6), and beside *mysteria* (13:2), and this invests the term with the significance of supernatural mystical knowledge—a meaning the word has in Hellenistic Greek, especially in the mystery cults." Though this may seem at first glance to support Grosheide, it actually does not. First, a *mystery* is not a "mystic feeling," as the present volume points out elsewhere. It is a secret, and usually quite understandable. Further, Arndt and Gingrich specifically refer to the "mystery cults"; but these "mysteries" were either cosmological, or certain taboos, like not eating beans, or directions how to behave in the future world. All this is *information*, not feeling. Finally, if Grosheide contrasts "thinking" with an "insight into things," it is difficult to see how insight can occur without thinking. When we say that a man has insight into the workings of an automobile, or insight into politics, do we not mean that he *understands* them? What could be more "intellectual"?

The New Testament highly recommends knowledge. To be sure, it is not the knowledge of the Gnostics. The knowledge they depended on for salvation was an intricate cosmological theory of thirty cons that constituted God's mind and

produced the visible world. It is far removed from anything in the Bible. Yet the contents of the Bible are also intelligible propositions. For this reason, Peter, in his second epistle, chapter one, verses two and three, and at intervals to its conclusion, can emphasize knowledge by saying: "Grace be multiplied to you by knowledge . . . as his divine power has endowed us with whatever conduces to life and piety by the knowledge of him who called us." Paul also, in Ephesians 1:17-18, makes five references to knowledge in two verses. The next chapter of the present epistle recommends one form of knowledge while rejecting another. Though the word *knowledge* is not one of the most frequent in Paul's epistles, the sentences he writes are intellectually comprehensible. They claim to be knowledge. First Corinthians does not spell out the role of knowledge in the same way Second Peter does; but contrary to pietism and neo-evangelicalism, there is no wholesale rejection of knowledge. The New Testament is not anti-intellectual.

With this understanding of Paul's meaning, one can more surely translate the word *logos*. Some commentators translate it as if God's enrichment consisted of an "aptitude for speech." However, this notion in the NASV has no basis in the text. No suggestion can be found that God made the Corinthians outstanding orators. Rather, one must suppose a parallelism between *logos* and *gnōsis*. God enriched them in doctrine and knowledge. If someone remarks that the Corinthians were no better at theology than they were at oratory, we may pause to reflect on the contrast between what seems to us an inadequate grasp of theology and the utter ignorance of pagan society. Most surely God had enriched them; and if God has not enriched us, in this advanced age, with a much more extensive knowledge, we should pray for mercy and theology.

6 The sentence continues: "you were enriched . . . in all knowledge, in proportion as the witness of Christ was confirmed in you. . . ." Presumably this means that Paul and his

aids preached faithfully and bit by bit established the truth in the minds of these Corinthians. This may not explain the role of knowledge quite so fully as II Peter and other passages, but it clearly indicates a proportion between increasing knowledge and the preaching of the gospel. The path to knowledge is attention to the message.

7 The sentence then goes on: "... so that you are not inferior [to other churches] in any gift, eagerly awaiting the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ." The RSV and the NAS translations are surely incorrect, when they say the Corinthians lacked no gift. The remainder of the epistle shows all too clearly how many gifts they lacked. For that matter, is there any church anywhere that has received every gift God can give?

The two versions just referred to do not say exactly that the Corinthians lacked no gift. In deference to a Greek preposition they say that the Corinthians were lacking "in" no gift. Now, "to lack no gift" is an unambiguous phrase. "To be lacking in no gift" is not a clear expression. What else could it mean than "to lack no gift"? Hence the English preposition has no function. Now, if the NAS and RSV use poor English, their Greek is even worse. The object of the verb *lack* in Greek is regularly in the genitive; here the word *gift* is dative. Hence it is not a gift that they lack. The better translation therefore would be: the Corinthians were not inferior with respect to any gift. This implies that they were not inferior to something.

The verb *for lack* means *fall behind, to be less than, to be inferior*. There must be some comparison. The verb is used in II Corinthians 11:15 and 12:11. In these instances, Paul was not inferior. The two verses specify to *what* Paul was not inferior, but note also that this *what*, the most distinguished apostles, is in the genitive case. However, although the present verse is without any genitive and does not complete the comparison, the sense must, and what else could the Corinthians be superior or inferior to, if not other churches.

Hence, the translation given: you are not inferior to the other churches in any gift.

8 The sentence continues: "who also will make you certain until the end and blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ."

In the remarks on verse two, someone may think that the present writer exceeded the proper limitations of exegesis. It was said that although the Corinthians were guilty of many sins, they would certainly increase in holiness and eventually become perfectly sinless. This idea cannot be exegeted out of the text of verse two. Nevertheless, the idea of progressive sanctification is clear enough here in verse eight. It says that Christ will make them still more certain of the truth of the doctrine as time goes on, or He will strengthen them on to the end. At the end, at the day of judgment, they shall be blameless. The word *blameless*, itself, presumably does not mean subjectively sinless. Paul no doubt is thinking of their judicial acquittal on the basis of Christ's imputed merit, but the phrase "establish until the end" is definitely an assertion of uninterrupted perseverance and, with whatever ups and downs, increasing growth in grace.

This sentence has been a complicated one—verses four through eight. Paul often wrote complicated sentences, and translators who are enamored of twentieth century style break them up. Still it is of some value to come into contact with the actual style of an author, even if it does not conform to twentieth century standards. Thus the sentence in its completeness reads: "I constantly thank my God concerning you for the grace of God given to you by Jesus Christ because in every respect you were enriched by him in all doctrine and knowledge in proportion as the witness of Christ was made certain in you, so that you are not inferior in any gift, eagerly awaiting the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ, who will also strengthen you to the end and make you blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ."

9 This is the climactic sentence that ends the paragraph.

"Faithful is God by whom you were called to fellowship with His Son Jesus Christ our Lord." Thus verse nine returns us to the idea of divine election that was repeated four times in the first two verses. God had called these Corinthians to Christ, not as spectacularly, but just as effectively as He had a few years before called Paul.

10-17 Summary. Having heard that there are schisms among the Corinthians, Paul urges unity in doctrine and disclaims any part in encouraging their divisions.

10 "I urge you, brethren, through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all say the same thing; and that there be no schisms among you, but that you be joined together in the same mind and have the same ideas."

This verse states what the following verses spell out in detail: that there were schisms in Corinth. Here Paul begins on the practical congregational problems discussed in the epistle. The first thing to ascertain is the meaning of the word *schism*. Without determining what such words mean, one can neither understand the situation at Corinth nor apply the remedy when needed today.

Ecumenical leaders in the twentieth century frequently castigate "splinter groups" and, contrary to their usual mode of forming their opinions, appeal to the Bible against schism. For them, schism is factionalism and organizational disruption. One liberal professor of religion, whom I know quite well, asserts positively in his classes that schism in the New Testament is not a matter of theological differences of opinion, but simply of factions within the church.

Not only liberals, but some also that think of themselves as evangelicals have the same opinion. For example, the paper *Living Today* (Scripture Press, Sept-Oct-Nov. 1972), speaking on this verse, says, "Cliques and intellectualism mar the testimony of a church in Paul's time or today." The article continues by referring to Corinth as "an intellectual and wicked Greek city." All this is mistaken for the most part. It is true that there were cliques in the Corinthian church, and it is

true that Corinth was a wicked city; but neither Corinth nor the Christian church in Corinth can be charged or credited with intellectualism.

According to Scripture Press, Christ's choice of the Twelve, who were unknown and uneducated, illustrates God's processes. So it does; but God's processes are also illustrated by His choice of Paul, the most intellectual Jew of his day. Scripture Press does not notice this. Its misunderstanding of Paul is egregious: "he aimed at their wills, not their minds. He knew . . . that you cannot argue people into Christianity."

It is quite true, of course—it is a blessed truth—that people cannot be argued into Christianity. Neither can they be preached into Christianity. Regeneration is the work of the Holy Spirit, and neither Paul nor any other evangelist can produce this result. That is not to say that evangelists should not preach or argue. The Scripture insists that they must. What Paul says about men's minds or intellect must be carefully noted as we proceed. Liberals generally, and some so-called evangelicals are rather far from Paul's position. Let us return to the idea of schism as factionalism.

It is quite possible that the Corinthians had begun, or were about to begin the formation of new organizations. Their sins obviously included overt action, and Paul condemned their actions. However, in this first chapter, the sin is not so much organizational activity—only verbal expression is specified—as it is matters of theory, principle, doctrine, opinion. Schism for Paul is clearly a matter of the intellect; it has to do with what one thinks.

Therefore, the remedy is agreement on theology. Paul urges them all to say the same thing. They should all be joined together in the same mind. Their principles, their ideas are to be identical. Contemporary ecumenical leaders quote Christ's prayer that they all may be one; but these leaders assume that "one" means "one organization." The ecumenists are not so fond of quoting verses on the blood of Christ

that purchased our redemption, but contrary to these views, Paul insists that doctrine is important and theological divergence is sin. Organizational union without theological agreement was precisely the trouble at Corinth. The remedy is intellectual unity.

11-12. "The [friends] of Chloe have made clear to me, my brethren, that there is strife among you. I mean, each of you says, I am of Paul's [party], I of Apollos, I of Cephas, I of Christ."

In some way or other the Corinthians had divided into four parties. Modern destructive critics propose an original deep-seated divergence between Petrine and Pauline Christianity. What later emerged was a compromise that does not represent the ideas of the real Jesus. This critical theory is not supported by the New Testament. Obviously Christ did not form a party at Corinth. Paul in the next verses emphatically denies responsibility. Nor is any reason evident for supposing that Apollos or Peter initiated these divisions. Galatians indeed describes a confrontation between Peter and Paul, but the text shows that the two agreed in doctrine. Paul did not accuse Peter of heresy; he accused him of hypocrisy. Hence the New Testament gives no hint of a theological disagreement among the apostles.

What happened was, as is indicated in later chapters, that some lesser leaders envied and belittled Paul. They even questioned his apostleship. They tried to undermine his influence and authority. Thus there were four parties in Corinth. However, although some commentators try to discern the theological peculiarities of these groups—Meyer has four pages of small print—such attempts depend on unsupported imagination.

More unsupported imagination is found in C. Milo Connick's book (see later on 5:9), p. 275. He says, "The words 'I belong to Christ' are probably a gloss. Some pious scribe . . . wrote the sentence in the margin of the MS. . . ." Even

Connick's attempt to be modest by using the word *probably* cannot be accepted because, in order to be probable, there must be at least a minimum of favorable evidence. Here, there is absolutely no evidence. His hypothesis is completely unsupported.

13-16. "Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you, or were you baptized into the name of Paul? I give thanks that I baptized none of you except Crispus and Gaius so that no one can say that I baptized into my own name. I also baptized the household of Stephen; but further than this I do not know whether I baptized anyone."

In opposition to these divisions, Paul asks, "Is Christ divided?" Paul had baptized very few of the Corinthians; he had not founded the church in his own name. Apollos may have baptized more people. The text does not say, and no one knows. Paul courteously does not mention Peter or Apollos. He replies only to the personal attack against himself, as becomes clearer in what follows. E. M. Robertson, in his commentary on this passage, shows himself to be one of those who attack Paul, for without any evidence at all he asserts, "Apollos appears to have been an interesting character. Paul tried not to be jealous of him, but he doesn't quite succeed!" This English minister attacks Paul, not only without evidence, but against evidence. He pays no attention to what Paul says of Apollos in the last chapter of the epistle, which we shall arrive at in good time.

17. "For Christ did not send me [send: make me an apostle; one sent] to baptize but to evangelize, not by wisdom of word, lest the cross of Christ should have been made useless."

Paul condemns those who claim him as the head of the church. Sometimes one's friends are more embarrassing than one's enemies. Paul's condemnation also has implications for other parties as well; but there is more force to his argument by speaking of himself, and his point can be made clearer by the fact that he baptized so few people. This inattention to

baptism proves that he is not responsible for these divisions. Should an apostle have been more interested in the sacrament? Well, he was busy evangelizing. He was not needed for baptizing. Someone else could do that as well as he, and while he may not have avoided baptizing consciously in order to prevent divisions, the event protected his reputation and enforced the Gospel at the same time.

Evangelization proceeded "not by wisdom of word." Does "wisdom of word" mean *polished rhetorical style*? If so, one might indeed hold that Paul was jealous of Apollos. However much *logos* can mean *what is preached, a sermon*, it is a poor word for the activity of preaching; and in any case *wisdom* is an almost impossible term to designate stylistic polish. To find jealousy here is to echo the Corinthian slander against Paul.

What then does the phrase "wisdom of word" mean? In 1:5, the Greek *logos* was translated *doctrine*. Should we here also so translate it and conclude that God did not send Paul to preach doctrine? However, Paul nowhere disparages doctrine. *Logos* can also mean a formula. Perhaps then the verse means, "Not by the wisdom of a baptismal formula, but by the doctrine of the Atonement." This interpretation connects nicely with the preceding references to baptism. One might even suppose that some of the theological divergencies alluded to in verse ten had to do with this sacrament, but there is nothing in the text to necessitate such an interpretation.

The best solution to this puzzle is to turn from the previous verses and take the phrase as an anticipation of the section on wisdom that now follows.

18-25 Summary: Secular science never brought anyone to God. God regards it as foolishness and will destroy it. Divine wisdom centers in the doctrine of the Atonement.

18 "For the word of the cross. . ." Here, again, is the Greek *logos*. If it can barely mean "cleverness of speech" in the previous verse, it can mean nothing else here but the *doctrine* of the Atonement. Paul does not object to doctrine,

argument, or theology; he strenuously objects to some teachings, certain arguments, and other systems of theology.

"For the word of the cross is nonsense to those who perish, but to us who are saved it is the power of God."

One should not fail to see that this statement contains two elements. The devout Christian loves to speak of the Word of life; and indeed, New Testament theology brings life. However, there is also the other and darker side. The Word of the cross not only brings life to some: it brings death to others. So Paul says in II Corinthians 2:16 that the Gospel is also a smell of death unto death to the lost.

The words *perish* and *saved* are present participles. Therefore, the RSV and NAS translate them "to those who are perishing and to us who are being saved." Now, it is perfectly proper to refer to a process of being saved—it is called sanctification; and no doubt in some sense there is also a process of being lost, but the emphasis on a process from the past to the future is not a necessary conclusion from present passive participles. They can as well indicate a present state. For example, in the active voice, "I save a dog from death"; in the passive voice, "the dog is saved." My rescue of the dog is a process; but the passive sentence describes the present state of the dog. In the text, it is not only grammatically possible, but it also makes better sense to take the participle as describing a state. Luke 13:23 and Acts 2:47, the NAS notwithstanding, do not refer to a process from not being saved, to being half-saved; and finally being fully saved. The latter verse particularly, even with its present participle, means that certain people were added to the church upon having been saved. When the perishing are also mentioned, as in the text, one cannot biblically regard them as progressing from not being lost, to being half-lost, and finally totally lost. Before regeneration, they are not engaged in any relevant process: they are in the state of death.

Since these people are dead in sin, they regard the Gospel as nonsense.

19 The previous verse contrasts the opinion of the unregenerate that the Gospel is nonsense with what the Christian knows to be true; that it is the power of God, as Romans 1:16 also says. In the present epistle, Paul defends his statement in 1:18 by giving 1:19 as his reason: "For it is written, I shall destroy the wisdom of the wise and I shall set aside the intelligence of the intelligent." The Old Testament establishes the point. Paul has quoted from Isaiah 29:14. Isaiah of course was referring to false prophets and unbelieving Jews. Paul also applies the quotation to the Jews in 1:22, but he extends it to the Gentiles in 1:23. Verse 21 applies to both Jews and Gentiles.

20 "Where is the wise man? Where is the scribe? Where is the cooperative investigator of this world? Has not God made nonsense of the world's wisdom?"

Inasmuch as the exponents of nondoctrinal and anti-intellectual Christianity (if one must call it Christianity) sometimes appeal to this section, it is pertinent to point out that Paul does not disparage doctrine and wisdom. He attacks this-worldly wisdom. Secular education is his target. The reason follows.

21 "For since in the wisdom of God the world by its wisdom did not know God, God decided to save believers by the nonsense of the Gospel."

Note that God foreordained pagan philosophy and Jewish apostasy for the purpose of blinding their eyes and hardening their hearts. The course of secular culture was no haphazard development. It was by the wisdom of God in controlling history that the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Greek philosophers could not know God. By this same divine wisdom, God ordained the salvation of the elect to be accomplished by the preaching of a doctrine the nonselect call nonsense.

22 "Whereas the Jews ask for signs and the Greeks seek wisdom. . . ."

When Paul speaks of the Jews as asking for signs, he may have had in mind something more pertinent than Gideon's

fleece and other Old Testament incidents. One may suppose that Christ's miracles had lost all value in their eyes because Jesus had been crucified. They therefore ask for new signs. Well, the apostles showed them signs. Paul can hardly mean to disparage the apostolic miracles. Similarly, he may not have condemned the Greek desire for wisdom. The trouble was that as the Greeks did not succeed in achieving divine wisdom, so too the Jewish preference for signs was futile. Remember that Father Abraham told the rich man in hell, when he asked that Lazarus be sent to warn his brothers, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead."

There is another minor puzzle in these verses: why should Paul speak so much about wisdom to the Corinthians—and in the first century, too? Both time and place contribute to the puzzle. The great philosophic achievements of Greece had taken place three hundred years previously, not in Corinth, but in Athens. Even Megara showed more love of wisdom than Corinth. Corinth was a business city with no pretence of education. This puzzle can be somewhat dissipated by recalling the phrase in 1:2, "in every place." Paul was addressing others in addition to the citizens of Corinth, and as for the golden age of Greece being three hundred years past, there were still some epigoni who lamely tried to preserve the tradition.

23-24 "... we on the other hand proclaim Christ crucified, a scandal to Jews, nonsense to Gentiles. But to the elect themselves, both Jews and Greeks, [we proclaim] Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God."

Although the usual translation of the first four words in verse 24 is "But to them who are called," the English phrase does not seem to preserve the intensive sense of the Greek pronoun. Goodwin's *Greek Grammar*, §989, says of the pronoun, *autos*, "In all its cases it may be an intensive adjective pronoun, himself, . . . themselves, (like *ipse*)." Goodwin gives examples, not only in the nominative, but also in the dative

plural, thus a phrase parallel to our text: "*ep' autois tois aigialois*, on the very coasts." This intensive sense heightens the contrast between the elect and the nonelect Jews and Greeks. It is the elect, themselves, as contrasted with those whom God did not call, who find Christ to be the power of God and the wisdom of God.

Very frequently, the New Testament presents doctrinal material in an indirect way. The first chapter of John directly and in some detail teaches the deity of Christ, but while Paul in Romans argues directly on the doctrine of justification by faith, as also in Galatians, it can probably be said that he never argues for the deity of Christ. That Christ is God is always or usually presupposed. Here, the phrase "the power of God and the wisdom of God" is used in direct opposition to secular opinion and Jewish prejudice. Indirectly, it assumes the deity of Christ. Who but God, Himself, could possibly be God's own wisdom and power?

25 "Because . . ." Here is the reason, perhaps not for the preceding verse, all by itself, but for the line of thought from 1:18 on. "Because the nonsense of God [God's moronic stupidity] is wiser than men, and God's weakness is stronger than men."

26-31 Summary: God chose weak and foolish things for the purpose of putting the world to shame so that no one could glory before Him.

26 Without a major break in the subject matter, the following verses are a paragraph to complete the argument. The first verb may be taken as indicative or imperative. If indicative, 1:26 is a simple statement of a reason; if imperative, a hortatory nuance is added. "For you see your election, brethren, that . . ." Here again is the doctrine of election. The Corinthians can look around and see that in general God called "not many wise according to the flesh, not many powerful, not many noble." It is important to note that God does not call everybody.

27 Since the previous verse speaks of wise men, power-

ful men, and men of noble birth, one would expect Paul to continue, "But God chose the morons of the world to put the wise to shame." This seems all the more likely because *the wise* is also masculine. As a matter of fact, however, Paul does not write "moronic people," but "moronic things," so that the accurate translation is the familiar one, "but God chose the foolish things of the world in order to shame the wise [masculine plural], and God chose the weak things of the world in order to shame the strong [things: neuter plural]."

Just why Paul uses neuter nouns here instead of masculine is hard to say. The difficulty increases in the following verse:

28 Here, the neuters continue, and in fact there are no more masculines: "And God chose the ignoble [things] of the world and the despised [things], nonexistent things, in order to destroy [abolish, nullify] the things that exist."

Yet, just as the masculine "well born" (*eugeneis*) has to refer to human beings, what else can "ignoble," without a distinguished family, of no kind or race, even though neuter, refer to except human beings?

Possibly the best suggestion is that the neuter has a more general connotation than the masculine. Particularly in the case of *ignoble* and *despised*, an English speaking Christian would normally use masculines. Jesus chose Galileans whom the Pharisees despised. Yet the next phrase shows how deliberately Paul chose neuters: "things that do not exist."

This phrase may be in apposition to the ignoble and despised, or it may be the last additional item of the list. In the interest of neuter generality, it seems better to take it as apposition. The Galileans and the Corinthian Christians are of such a low class that in the eyes of high society, they just do not exist.

29 The complicated sentence, begun at 1:26 concludes here, with the main purpose clause: "in order that no flesh should boast before God." The reason God did not elect and

did not call many people of worldly importance, but mainly restricted his call to peasants, business men, and low born, was to humble mankind, and as the next two, the last two verses of the chapter say, to exalt the grace of God and the work of Christ.

30 "Of him," of God, not of yourselves, "you are in Christ Jesus. . . ." It is not because of any decision of ours that we are Christians. We are regenerate because of God's electing choice. See the comments on verses one, four, and nine.

"... who became." The NAS has the best translation. *Became* is hardly *is made*, as the KJ has it; nor *was made*, as in the ARV; nor *made* in the RSV; but *became*. The verb is a late Doric form.

"... became wisdom for us from God. . . ." Of course, Christ is the eternal wisdom of God: He never *became* such, but He became wisdom for or to us, in time, by His atoning work.

Now, to get the verse in its entirety: "Of him you are in Christ Jesus, who became wisdom for us from God, both righteousness and holiness and redemption."

The relationship among these things that Christ became to us is not quite clear. The first difficulty is the number of items. Are there four? Or are there only three: wisdom, righteousness and holiness, considered as one, and redemption? To answer this, another question must be asked. By *righteousness* does Paul mean subjective ethical activity, in which case it would be identical to holiness, or does Paul mean the perfect righteousness of Christ imputed to us, in which case righteousness and holiness would be separate items? A third question is, how does *redemption* fit into either of these possibilities? The Greek conjunction may throw some light on this. Wisdom is the first on the list, then the double conjunction *te kai* indicates that righteousness and holiness are more closely connected than they would be with the simple conjunction *kai*. However, since *te kai* can join opposite con-

cepts, or connected though different concepts (Heb. 5:1, gifts and sacrifices; Acts 1:1, to do and to teach; Acts 8:12, men and women; and just above 1:24, Jews and Greeks), the grammar does not require righteousness and holiness to be synonymous. There is a distinct possibility that Paul means *imputed righteousness* and subjective holiness.

This interpretation is thoroughly Pauline, but it still leaves unsolved the order of the four items. Redemption, if it refers to Christ's sacrifice on the cross, as might be inferred from 1:17-18, should precede imputed righteousness and subjective holiness. Of course, wisdom is appropriately first, since none of the others would have occurred unless God had decided that it was wise to put such a plan into effect. With this in mind, it is possible to understand the last three items as examples of God's wisdom. This fits the order of conjunctions very well: Christ became wisdom to us, namely, righteousness, holiness, redemption; all three. The grammatical point is that *te kai* can be used with three items.

Now, finally, there is a reasonable explanation why redemption can stand last. Remember that redemption was not actually completed on the cross. To be redeemed is to be redeemed both from the penalty and the power of sin (cf. Eph. 1:14 and 4:30; especially Titus 2:14; and perhaps Heb. 9:12). Hence the completion of redemption can be the future climax of this list.

31 Continuing the sentence and concluding the chapter: "that as it is written, Let him who boasts, boast in the Lord." Two verses above there were two purpose clauses: God selected nonexistent things *in order to* destroy the existent things, *in order that* no flesh should boast. Man has no cause for boasting about his accomplishments, for it is of God that we are in Christ. This purpose is now repeated to close the chapter. The expression, however, is a condensed quotation from Jeremiah 9:24, and Paul retains it in its imperative form: "Let him who boasts, boast in the Lord."

1-5 Summary: In his ministry to the Corinthians, Paul repudiates worldly wisdom and preaches Christ crucified in order that their faith should be based on the power of God.

1 "When I came to you, brethren, I did not come with excellence of speech or wisdom, proclaiming the mystery of God."

Although the word *logos* was translated as *doctrine* in chapter one, the verb *proclaim* may seem to make *speech* the better translation here. Yet the phrase hardly means excellence of literary style. The words *wisdom* and *mystery* point to the contents of the message rather than to its form. The contents were not some bright new ideas that would develop common Corinthian opinion to an exciting level of excellence. The contents were the mysteries of God.

Paul proclaimed either the *mystery* or the *testimony* of God. The two Greek words have several letters alike. *Mystery* is the more ancient reading; *testimony* counts the greater number of MSS. Even if one adopts the latter reading, the fact that the best MSS have *mystery* shows that in the Greek mind a mystery is not something "mysterious" in the common English sense. In English, the word *mystery* is often used to designate something quite unintelligible, and not something merely unknown. I do not know whether it will rain tomorrow or not; but rain is no mystery. In the New Testament, however, rain or any future event is a mystery. For the Corinthians, when Paul first came to them, the crucifixion of Christ was a mystery because they had not heard of it. Here is a case where *mystery* refers to a past event. It was this past event that Paul proclaimed. Or, perhaps more accurately, the mystery was the doctrine of the Atonement, and not the bare fact that Christ had died. Later on in this epistle,

15:51, Paul tells the Corinthians another mystery: "we shall not all die." This is no unintelligible jargon. It is a plain statement of fact. The outside world may not believe that it is true; but they have no difficulty understanding its meaning. In this second chapter, the mystery is clearly stated in the next verse: the message of the cross.

2-3 "I decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified. And in weakness and in much trembling I came to you. . . ."

In preaching the Atonement so single-heartedly, Paul was not without personal troubles. He had physical infirmities and was no doubt often weak. Perhaps, however, the weakness he had in mind was the human inability, mainly spiritual, to accomplish the task of evangelization. Yet since he knew God had called him, he might well have been bold. What then about fear? Was he afraid of stoning or imprisonment? Previous hardships had not deterred him. Was he afraid of being unsuccessful? So also trembling. The next two verses with their references to preaching, the wisdom of men, and the power of God, require us to understand the puzzling words as expressions of humility.

4 "and my message and my preaching. . . ." The NAS wisely translates *logos* as message. Here the message preached and the action of preaching are each mentioned. Since the second term is explicit, the first should be regarded as the message.

"My message and my preaching were not" with enticing words of man's wisdom (KJ) or, in persuasive words of wisdom (NAS), or the impossible attempts of Phillips and the NEB. The sense of the verse is so clear as to need no comment; but the textual problem is about the worst in all the New Testament.

Excursus

Since this book has been prepared for those who study alone and for adult Bible classes, rather than for seminary

students with competent professors, this verse is an excellent point of departure for a very elementary explanation of textual criticism. Anyone who is uninterested can skip over it to the resumption of the commentary.

In March 1516, a year and a half before Luther posted his theses and began the Reformation, Erasmus, a scholar who later attacked Luther, edited and was the first to publish the Greek New Testament. A much more carefully prepared edition had been printed two years earlier, but somehow was not distributed. Upon learning of this in April 1515, Erasmus saw a chance to be first and worked so rapidly that he finished his edition by March 1516. The better edition did not appear until 1520.

Naturally such speed is poor scholarship. Furthermore, although there exist several thousand New Testament MSS (depending on how many fragmentary copies one counts), Erasmus used only a very few that happened to be at hand. They were all cursives. A cursive is one written in ordinary flowing handwriting, as distinct from the more carefully prepared uncials, done by hand of course, but in "printed" capital letters.

In the case of the Apocalypse at least, Erasmus had only one MS, and it lacked the final six verses. So he completed his New Testament by translating the Latin Vulgate back into Greek. It is not surprising that some of his words are not to be found in any MS. In spite of its serious defects, the second edition, not greatly corrected, became the basis for the *Textus Receptus*, or Received Text, which continued to be the standard text until the end of the nineteenth century.

So much for the early history. Now for the methods of textual criticism.

If several scribes at different times copy a single MS, and even more so if they copy different MSS of the same work, they will make a number of mistakes. They spell some words incorrectly; they may misread what they are copying; they may insert in their writing a marginal note; they may trans-

pose words; or various things. Of course, the large majority of the words in all copies will be identical; and where they all agree, one may be reasonably confident that such is the original text. Nevertheless, there will be numerous variant readings. Though it may seem at first strange to the uninitiated, the more variants there are, the more nearly certain can one be that the text is original. If there were only one MS, and hence no variants, as was the case with Erasmus and the Apocalypse, there would be no possibility of ascertaining the original. There would be no method by which to discover where the scribe had made a mistake. Hence, Erasmus' text of the last book is worthless. When there are variants among the longer parts that agree, one sees where the mistakes occurred, and in many instances can easily tell which variant is correct.

Without specific examples, without a knowledge of the exact details, a person upon first hearing that there are variant readings might jump to the conclusion that the whole is untrustworthy. This is too great a jump. The following examples, all from First Corinthians, will make this clear.

In I Corinthians 1:1, the word *called* (*kletos*) is missing in three uncials—a fact hardly worth mentioning.

In I Corinthians 1:4, there are three readings for the phrase, "I thank my God." *Theōi mou*, God of me, is found in a correction inserted in Aleph, a very important uncial of the fourth century, in A, another important uncial of the fifth century, C, D, G, P, Y, other less valuable uncials, and a long list of cursives. *Theōi hēmōn*, God of us, occurs in one cursive, and is therefore insignificant. *Theōi* alone, without the *mou*, is found in the original of Aleph and in B, another very important uncial of the fourth century. Despite the fact that the combination of Aleph and B makes an important witness, these two are not enough to set aside the contrary evidence. The best text will therefore be, "I thank my God."

To be noted, in addition to the nature of the evidence, is the fact that here and very frequently the variant readings all

mean much the same thing. Sometimes, about once in a thousand words, one reading is significantly different in meaning from another; but at other times the difference is merely a matter of spelling or the order of the words. Some MSS may have Jesus Christ and others Christ Jesus. Or, as in 1:8, nearly all MSS have "our Lord Jesus Christ," while a very early papyrus omits the word "Christ." The same papyrus in 1:13 has "Christ is not divided, *is he?*" That is, p 46, two cursives; and an eleventh century dictionary insert the negative *mē*, while all the other MSS omit it. Uninformed unbelievers may ignorantly assert that we can have no notion what the apostles said; but textual criticism refutes any such wild speculation. Even when there is a difference in meaning, its location is exactly known. It is not as if a cloud of doubt hovered over the entire text. On the contrary, whatever doubt attaches to a few scattered verses, the other verses are not affected.

Now, one or two more examples. In 1:14, the original Aleph and B have "I give thanks"; a third correction in Aleph, five lesser uncials, and many cursives have, "I give thanks to God"; and some inferior cursives have, "I give thanks to my God."

In 1:28 p 46, the original Aleph, A, and some other uncials have *ta mē onta* (things that do not exist), while the third correction in Aleph, B, some corrections in uncials, and many cursives have *kai ta mē onta* (and things that do not exist).

There are a few other variants in chapter one, but they are too insignificant to mention.

In chapter two, the variant *mystery* versus *testimony* has already been mentioned; and then comes the verse from which this discussion took off. It is surely one of the worst textual difficulties in all the New Testament, and therefore it is worth the tedium of going through it once.

Peithōis sophias logos (persuasive of wisdom words), although the original Aleph has *logos* (singular nominative instead of dative plural) and D gr [the Greek text of a bilingual

MS where it differs from the version] has *peithōis*, is the reading of Aleph, B, the third correction in D and some cursives.

Peithōis sophias kai logos is found in one cursive.

Peithōis anthrōpinēs sophias logos is found in the third correction of Aleph; four uncials, except that two of them read *peithōis*, and a number of cursives. *Anthrōpinēs* means human.

Peithos sophias anthrōpinē logos, *peithoi sophias logou anthrōpou*, *peithoi sophias logos*, *peithoi sophias logon*, *peithōis sophias*, *peithoi sophias*, *peithoi logon*, and *peithōs logos sophias* are other variants. This makes over a dozen variants in all.

The problem is further complicated by the fact that the word *peithos* (nom.) occurs nowhere else in all Greek literature; though here *peithōis* as well as *sophias* cannot be doubted as the correct text. *Anthrōpinēs* makes good sense and is better attested than some other variants, but when so many MSS do not have it, it is far from being certain. The first variant mentioned above is presumably the best, but there are few other passages in the New Testament where the evidence is so inconclusive. Colossians 2:2 is one of them. Yet, note well, in spite of all these complications, the meaning remains the same. Here ends the excursus of textual criticism.

4 "... but by demonstration of Spirit and of power." The phrase presumably contrasts the persuasion that follows secular reasoning with the preaching of the Gospel. The former wins a few adherents to new views, without much changing their moral or religious ideals; the latter led large numbers of lusty bustling business men into a life style all the principles of which and many of the practices were completely the opposite of their pagan society, "so that the Spirit and power gave the proof."

5 "... in order that..." In classical Greek, this conjunction, *hina*, is strongly purposive. In *Koine*, the common language of the Roman epoch, the meaning had weakened, so

that it sometimes introduces a result clause. Hence one could understand the verse as, "but by demonstration of the Spirit with the result that your faith should not exist by the wisdom of men, but by the power of God." Nevertheless one should never neglect consideration of the original meaning of *kina*; and if the sense is good, it should be preferred. Then the verse would say, "by demonstration of the Spirit, in order that your faith," and so forth. If it is taken as a purpose clause, one must ask, whose purpose? Was it Paul's motive? It might be. Paul chose preaching the cross rather than Aristotle's argument for the existence of God *in order that* their faith should depend on the power of God. Yet there is another and probably better connotation here. The purpose was God's: God sent Paul with the message of the cross *in order that* faith should rest on or exist in divine power, *in order that* no one could boast. The reason for preferring the divine motivation is that, although Paul refers to his own preaching, that preaching itself was by the power of the Spirit. The main point is that the whole is God's work. The Corinthians were made Christians by divine power.

6-16 Summary: Although Paul had repudiated worldly wisdom, his message was wisdom, nonetheless, but it was a divinely revealed wisdom, incapable of being discovered by (religious, scientific, or sensory) experience. Not that the human mind is unable to understand these secrets: God has given us the power to understand, and so we have the mind of Christ.

6 It had at this point become imperative to prevent the Corinthians from thinking that the divine message is indeed nonsense, foolishness, irrational, or "paradoxical"—in the dialectical sense. What Paul preached was indeed wisdom.

"Wisdom, nevertheless, [is what] we speak among the *teleiois*."

Teleios is usually translated "perfect" or "mature." The verse then could mean that Paul gave only the pabulum of the Atonement to the freshmen (cf. 3:1), while he lectured on

advanced theology to the seniors. This interpretation in no way contradicts Paul's claim to have declared the whole counsel of God. Obviously, an evangelist cannot cover all theology in a week or two. Nor does it mean that there is a sharp division between the primary, the secondary, and the advanced lessons. Paul recognizes no antithesis between a rudimentary "Kerygma" and "church doctrine." There are, however, degrees of understanding among converts, and they progress step by step from freshman to seniors with two (or three) semesters each year.

There is another possible interpretation of this verse. The word for *mature* might be translated *initiated*. The mystery religions had initiates: they had been initiated, in other words, they had been told the secrets. If this be the meaning, then *teleios* means simply a Christian, a convert, anyone who has heard and has accepted the message.

It is unlikely that Paul had the initiation rites of the mystery religions very definitely in mind; yet the suggestion has a point to it, if proper qualifications are made. If *teleios* means "convert," it would follow that the advanced lectures to seniors would not be the only wisdom, but that all of Paul's preaching would be wisdom. Surely this is what Paul intends, for the doctrine of the Atonement, the only specific doctrine mentioned, must be considered as revealed wisdom, and yet it was not reserved for advanced Christians: it was preached to the Corinthians before they were converted.

Furthermore, the passage and context does not divide the Corinthians into two groups—elementary and advanced. In fact, when Paul berates the church for its factionalism, he berates them all. It was not the recent converts who formed factions while the advanced did not; nor vice versa. The condemnation is addressed to the church as a whole.

It must be admitted that *teleios* and its derivatives, occurring about forty-seven times in the New Testament, seem to mean *perfect* or *mature* in every other instance; but in this instance *convert* makes much better sense.

6b "... but [it is] a wisdom not of this world nor of this world's rulers, who are being done away with."

This part of the verse substantiates the interpretation of the preceding. The antithesis is not between two groups of Christians; or two levels of the Christian message, but between the Christians and the unbelieving world.

That the worldly powers are passing away does not mean that one Roman emperor dies and another succeeds him, but rather that the predestined course of history will wipe out all human government, and Christ will reign alone. The main purpose of this section does not permit Paul to expatiate on this idea. The important matter here is the distinction between divine wisdom and the futile gropings of experience.

7 "But we speak God's wisdom in a secret, the hidden [wisdom], which God, before the world [began], predetermined for our glory."

The *but* which begins 2:7 is a strong adversative. It emphasizes a contrast between divine secrets and worldly wisdom. The divine secrets and their revelation to us were fore-ordained for our glory.

It is impossible to read much of Paul intelligently without being impressed by his constant preoccupation with the doctrine of foreordination, predestination, predeterminism, and divine election. This verse indicates, first, that God from eternity had a plan of history, a plan by which worldly wisdom would prove useless and a divine secret would prove powerful. Second, the verse also indicates that God predetermined the course of history for our glory. It is a plan of salvation, and without any possibility of failure it must succeed by God's omnipotent power. The phrase "to our glory" is the climactic contrast with "being done away with."

8 "... which [wisdom] none of this world's rulers knew, for had they known, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory."

The meaning is superficially clear: if the Pharisees and Pontius Pilate had known the divine secrets that Paul now

preached to the Corinthians, they would have acknowledged Jesus as the Christ, the Messiah, and would not have crucified Him. Their predestined ignorance, however, was part of the divine plan. God could have told them the secrets. He could have given them faith, if He had wanted to, but Herod, Pilate, the Jews, and the Gentiles were gathered together to do what His hand and His counsel previously determined to occur.

Yet Jesus prayed, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do." If responsibility is proportional to knowledge, what will the implications be? A person without seminary training, studying alone, is advised to consider carefully whatever in the New Testament bears on the conditions of responsibility. For which of our actions are we held accountable, for which not, and in what degrees? One should not thoughtlessly jump to conclusions. The problem, however, may prove a trifle difficult for a beginner, so let us proceed with the commentary.

9-10 "But as it is written, what things the eye did not see and the ear did not hear, and did not enter man's mind, what things God prepared for those who love him, to us God revealed them through the Spirit."

Here, by condensing Isaiah 64:4 and 52:15, Paul enforces the distinction between an empirical religion and a religion of revelation. One must not suppose that Paul intended a verbatim quotation. Critics sometimes try to impose intolerable stringencies on how by orthodox standards an apostle ought to use the Old Testament, but apostles, as well as present-day authors, can use literary allusions without being properly charged with having misquoted their source. Furthermore, the contexts of the two verses in Isaiah are not quite the same, nor either of them with the present passage. Nevertheless, Isaiah 64 refers to some sort of salvation and Isaiah 52 more clearly refers to the Atonement. So the contexts do not clash. The main idea of all three passages, however, is that God reveals what man otherwise could never know.

The word *kardian* is best translated *mind*. Of course, it

means *heart*, and from it English derives the term *cardiac*. However, in literary English, the word *heart* has taken on a romantic and emotional connotation foreign to biblical usage. If one should list all the verses in the Bible that contain either the Hebrew or Greek word, and then try to read them, first by using the term *emotion*, and secondly using the term *mind*, it would be compellingly clear that the word *emotion* usually reduces the Scripture to nonsense and that the second almost always is correct.

Finally, 2:9 is not a grammatical sentence by itself. One expedient is to insert the verb *we speak*: "But we speak as it is written." The *we speak* is a repeat from 2:6-7. This is not impossible, though the repeat comes at an uncomfortable distance. A second expedient is to let 2:9 simply hang in the air—an ejaculation that needs no verb. However, in view of the fact that Paul writes so many intricate sentences, it would be normal to punctuate as follows: Put a semi-colon after 2:6, a comma after 2:7, a semi-colon after 2:8, and a comma after 2:9. A period after 2:6 is possible. It is even possible, though awkward, to put a period after 2:8, but 2:9 requires 2:10 for its completion, for Paul wants to insist that "to us God revealed what the eye could not see."

10 "... for the Spirit searches all things, even the profound [truths] of God."

This verse seems to be a reason why God was able to reveal His secrets: He knew them. The reason does indeed seem superfluous. Does it need stating that God can reveal His secrets because He knows them? Furthermore, the verb *search* (*eraunai*) is puzzling. Does the Spirit, God Himself, have to *search out* and take trouble to discover these secrets? The idea of searching occurs also in Psalm 139:1 and Romans 8:27. To escape the difficulty, Hodge asserts, "The word does not express the process of investigation, but rather its results, namely, profound knowledge." However, the word indeed expresses a process. For example, Pinder uses the phrase "you will find by searching" (*heurēsais erounōn*). This

difficulty, however, can be removed by regarding such passages as anthropopathisms. As a bit of evidence for the personality and deity of the Spirit, the verse is excellent, but it still seems to remain an unnecessary reason for the preceding. Naturally God knows His profound truths and naturally He can reveal as much or as little as He wishes.

11 The reason why God knows Himself seems to be continued here by means of a human parallel. "For who among men knows the [thoughts] of the man if not the spirit of the man that is in him?"

The thought here is difficult. On the surface, it seems that Paul is giving reasons why God can reveal His secrets. If this were all, and it will become clear that this is not all, Paul would need to say, God can reveal because He knows, as a man can tell his thoughts to another man because he knows what he is thinking.

The words *if not*, however, are ambiguous. One meaning is, even if some other people know a man's thoughts, who could possibly know if not the man himself? The man, himself, is in a favored position, and if he could not discover what he thinks, no one else has a better possibility. The second meaning translates *if not* as *except*: who can know a man's thought except the man himself—no one else could possibly discover them. So far as Greek grammar goes, either translation (*if not* or *except*) is possible. The context must decide. Here the context very strongly asserts that no one but God can know these secrets before they are revealed. Human investigation cannot possibly discover these truths.

This results in damaging the parallelism. Within the sphere of humanity, it is possible sometimes for one man to discover the thoughts of another. This latter, so we say, "gives himself away"; in other words, he reveals his thought unwittingly or even against his will. Therefore, commentators wisely warn against pressing human illustrations beyond the intention of the author. The idea of an involuntary revelation by the omnipotent God is an impossible idea. Therefore, the

parallel is to be loosely taken, and the conclusion is, "So also no one knows the things of God except the Spirit of God."

Another reason for caution in interpreting human illustrations is that here someone might try to conclude that God like the man is a unitarian person and the "Spirit" is simply the soul of this single person. When the main thrust of the Scripture as a whole rules out an interpretation, it should not be imposed on an illustration.

The use of human illustrations is not inconsistent with the inerrancy of verbal revelation. God not only used the complicated sentence structure of Paul as well as the simple grammar of John, but He also used His prophets' ordinary choice of figures. There is a strange prophecy in Jeremiah 51:42, "The sea has come up over Babylon; she has been engulfed with its tumultuous waves; her cities have become . . . a parched land and a desert. . . ." Here if anywhere is a mixed metaphor. However, so long as some people mix their metaphors, God can inspire such language, and no one but an unimaginative liberal will take it otherwise than as a metaphor.

12 As for us, "We have not received the spirit of the world, but the Spirit that [comes] from God. . . ."

Hodge interprets the verse so as to restrict the subject *we* to the apostles, excluding other Christians. The spirit of the world he identifies as human reason, which the apostles did not use in obtaining their message. However, both these points seem to be incorrect. The plurals of 2:6-7 certainly include the apostles. As a matter of fact, they could be taken as the "editorial *we*" to refer to Paul alone. However, since Paul uses the singular "I" throughout 2:1-5, the change to the plural can more naturally be understood to include the other apostles. If so, why not Apollos and anyone else who was preaching the Gospel? Furthermore, the phrases *those who love him* and *to us* take in all Christians. Certainly Isaiah was not restricting his remarks to the prophets alone.

As for the second point: since the Spirit that comes from

God is the Holy Spirit, the other spirit must not be taken as something less than a personal being. Paul means neither human reason as such, nor merely the pagan climate of opinion. As he clearly asserts the existence of demons a few chapters further on, so here he explains the pagan climate of opinion as the result of the people's having received instruction from demons. The demons may not have given them a verbal revelation as the Holy Spirit gave the apostles directly and the Christians indirectly, but the demons controlled the thinking of their worshippers.

12b "... in order that we might know the things with which God has favored us. . . ."

Meyer supposes that these gracious gifts are the future Messianic blessings enjoyed now in anticipation. The following verse, if it does not make such an interpretation completely impossible, at least leaves it without support.

13 "which things also we speak; not in didactic words of human wisdom; but in didactic [words] of the Spirit, explaining spiritual [matters] in spiritual [words]."

The gracious gift of God therefore consists of words, the words Paul, himself, had spoken. These words, or better, the spiritual matters expressed by the words, were taught not by human wisdom, but by the Spirit.

The margin of the NAS translates the last phrase of the verse, "interpreting spiritual things to spiritual men"; and the frequently undependable RSV has "interpreting spiritual truths to those who possess the Spirit."

The dative adjective *pneumatikois* is the form used for both the masculine and the neuter. By itself, it can mean either spiritual persons or spiritual things. One must consider the context. Here, the context requires a reference to *words* rather than to *persons*. The previous verse spoke of our knowing what gifts God has given us. The present verse begins with a relative pronoun referring to these gifts: "We announce these gifts." Note next that we do not announce these gifts in the *didactic words* (dative plural) of human

wisdom, but in the didactic [words] of the Spirit. The subject matter is *words not persons*. Therefore, the very next word, the dative plural (*pneumatikois*) must refer to spiritual words and not spiritual persons. Paul insists strongly on verbal revelation. Revelation by words is God's blessing upon us.

14 "The 'psychic' man does not receive [accept or welcome] the [truths] of the Spirit of God, for they are nonsense to him, and he cannot know [them], for they are evaluated spiritually."

Psychikos is the adjective from *psychē*, soul. The word occurs six times in the New Testament, three times later in 1 Corinthians 15:44, 46, and once each in James 3:15 and Jude 19. In 1 Corinthians 15, it simply means *natural*: a natural body, made of flesh and bones. The other instances all carry a morally derogatory connotation. The KJ *sensual* is a good translation.

The sensual man—James adds *devilish* (*daimoniōdēs*)—does not welcome truth as a guest in his home. That is, he does not accept divine truths as true. He does not believe them. This does not mean that he does not understand them. College students today, brainwashed by the socialistic public schools into believing in the dignity and essential goodness of every human being, understand the doctrine of total depravity fairly well, if it is explained by a Christian professor; but they consider it to be outrageously false. It is more ridiculous than believing the earth is flat, and so they do not know it as true. They know it well enough. The most accurate answer to a question on justification by faith was written in a college exam by the one student in the class who most vigorously rejected it. When the verse here says that they do not know the doctrine, it means they do not know it as true; and the reason is immediately given: for it is spiritually evaluated. The sensual demonic student cannot properly evaluate what he explains so accurately on his quiz paper. Naturally, such persons cannot believe, for as Jesus said of the Pharisees,

"Therefore they could not believe because Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their heart; that they should not see with their eyes nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them" (John 12:39-40).¹

15 "The spiritual man evaluates all things, but is himself evaluated [judged, condemned] by no one."

By *spiritual*, the apostle does not mean some aesthetic or emotional person whose head is in the clouds and who disdains careful thought on theological matters, but one whose thinking is controlled by the Holy Spirit. This thinking is indeed controlled, but it is *thinking* none the less, thinking the didactic words of the Spirit, and here mainly identified with the doctrine of the Atonement.

The remainder of the verse is not so easy. A strict logical parallel would have required: the spiritual man evaluates all doctrines but no doctrine evaluates him. This, however, makes poor sense. Therefore, *no one* must be taken as masculine, even though it destroys the logical parallel. Grammatically *no one* is either masculine or neuter. Probably, as with puns in English, the Greeks saw an interesting comparison in the words themselves, and did not reflect on the gender. The parallel is therefore grammatical or "declensional," rather than ideal or logical.

There is also another difficulty. What is the point of saying a Christian is evaluated by no one? Was not Paul evaluating the Corinthian Christians? He also urges them in the following chapters to evaluate each other. Or does it mean that since only God can see a man's heart and know his sincerity,

1. This verse from John does not contradict the assertion some lines above that the sensual man can understand Christian doctrines. Surely John and Jesus knew that the Pharisees could see Jesus with their eyes. Similarly, if the Pharisees had not understood the meaning of Christ's claim to Deity, they would not have been so savage. It is not too much to say that the Pharisees understood Christ's claims better than the disciples did. However, there is another sense in which they did not understand. Liddell and Scott give as their fourth meaning of *oreō* "consider, deem, presume to be so and so." The sense, therefore, is to understand something to be true, not just to understand the meaning of the words.

no man can judge any man, believer or not. This may be true, but it reduces the verse to irrelevant triviality. Since the next verse is the reason given, perhaps the reason will explain the sense:

16 "For who has known the mind of the Lord; [and] who will instruct him?"

In Romans 11:34, the apostle also uses the same idea from Isaiah 40:13, but how is 2:16 a reason for 2:15? Shall we say, because no one can instruct the Lord, therefore no one can evaluate a Christian? Surely this is a fallacious inference: Paul could not instruct the Lord, but the Lord enabled him to judge individual Christians—he even delivered one man over to Satan for the destruction of his flesh, that his spirit might be saved. The last phrase rather indicates that the culprit was indeed a Christian in spite of his sin, and Paul judged him. Paul wanted the other Corinthians to judge him too. Hence, Christians can and ought to judge Christians.

In fact, this is what the remainder of 2:16 broadly hints at: "We have the mind of Christ." God alone may see the hearts of men, but if we have the mind of Christ, cannot we judge or evaluate Christians and non-Christians too? How then is inability to instruct the Lord a reason for the preceding?

The easiest solution is to take *no one* as *no unbeliever*. Unfortunately, Paul does not say this clearly, but it seems to be what he means because the reason applies: unbelievers do not have the mind of the Lord and therefore cannot evaluate Christians.

Even so, there is a little unevenness, not only because Paul did not explicitly limit the *no one*, but also because the reason does not quite seem to fit. A general argument should apply equally to all cases; and if inability to instruct the Lord makes evaluation impossible, the Christian would be debarred from judging as well as the unbeliever, for neither can instruct the Lord. This makes the verse puzzling.

Charles Hodge tried to clarify Paul's argument by putting

it in the form of a syllogism, as follows: "No one can instruct the Lord. We have the mind of Christ. Therefore, no one can judge us." Hodge supports this doubtful syllogism with an added thought that would make it cogent. The Christian has the mind of Christ because he believes the doctrines. To condemn the doctrines would be to instruct the Lord, which no one can do. This makes excellent sense and is no doubt a good argument; but it does not quite fit the text. The text does not say that the pagans cannot judge the doctrines; it says the pagans cannot judge the Christians. The end of verse 16 is "*he himself* is judged by no one."

Perhaps the best way to solve the puzzle is to interpret its words as saying: No one can judge a Christian insofar as he has the mind of Christ, although at times his conduct may be clearly reprehensible.

Two other points in this verse are clearer. The first is a point the Corinthians would not have thought of disputing, but which the Arians and modern critics do. Note that Paul quotes from an Old Testament passage that lays great stress on the transcendence of God. He applies this passage to Christ, thus identifying Jesus with Jehovah. The two are the same person. Nowhere does Paul argue for the deity of Christ, as he argues in detail on other matters of lesser importance; but he everywhere assumes that Jesus is God.

There is another point that needs emphasis in our modern epoch. The bald assertion that we have the mind of Christ is the refutation of all pietistic, nondoctrinal, anti-intellectual, antitheological "Christianity." It is undoubtedly true that we do not have all the mind of Christ and that we need more instruction, but it is also indubitably true that the doctrines already received are Christ's mind. What we think and what Christ thinks (in these cases) are identical. Our concepts are not inadequate concepts (granting, of course, that we lack other of Christ's concepts), nor are they analogical or similar concepts. They are indeed Christ's concepts, His own mind, the very wisdom of God.

Excursus on Wisdom²

Colossians 2:3 says that all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden in Christ. In this verse, the words *wisdom* and *knowledge* can be taken as synonyms. But I Corinthians 12:8, the final mention of wisdom in that epistle after a break since 3:19, is hard to interpret unless one assumes a difference between wisdom and knowledge: "To each one the manifestation of the Spirit is given for his advantage. For to one through the Spirit is given [a, or the] word of wisdom, and to another a word of knowledge according to the same Spirit, [and] to another faith. . . ." Of course faith is given to all Christians; and no doubt knowledge and wisdom are somehow connected because they are both expressed in words, in a *logos*: a discourse, sermon, or argument of wisdom and a discourse, sermon, or argument of knowledge. But since these two are in an enumeration of nine gifts of the Spirit, the two phrases can hardly be taken as completely synonymous.

What this distinction is has caused confusion among the commentators. A frequently made distinction is that wisdom refers to practical judgments and knowledge consists in theoretical understanding. H. A. W. Meyer, however, reverses this. Referring to 2:6 and 13:2, Meyer makes wisdom an elementary grasp of Christian doctrines, whereas knowledge is a deep and thorough elaboration of their connections. Much to one's surprise Meyer then infers that wisdom (the elementary grasp of Christian doctrines) continues throughout the Parousia, but knowledge (the profound elaboration of their relationships) ceases (13:8). Surely this view, or, at least this conclusion has less to recommend it than the former does.

Charles Hodge makes the almost impossible suggestion that wisdom is the inspiration given to the apostles alone, and knowledge is the ability of lesser teachers to understand the

apostles' writings. The reason this seems impossible is the fact that I Corinthians 13:8 says that knowledge shall be abolished or made of no effect. Since the ability of lesser teachers to understand the apostles' writings continues to the present day, the time prophesied must be the Parousia. But is it not strange that the lesser teachers should lose their ability to understand the Scriptures by reason of Christ's return? One would expect them to understand better. There is something, however, that has already been abolished: viz., apostolic inspiration. But 13:8 does not say that "wisdom" (Hodge's inspiration) shall be abolished; it says the "knowledge" will become of no use.

This is sufficient to cast doubt on Hodge's distinction between wisdom and knowledge. It is not sufficient as an explanation of 13:8. Under any imaginable condition it hardly seems possible that knowledge should be of no use. Nor that it should be abolished. The following verses can be taken to imply that partial knowledge will be abolished because full knowledge supervenes. Indeed, Paul almost seems to say that human knowledge will equal God's, for "now I know in part, but then I shall know to the same extent that I was known" [by God?]. Hodge rather evades the difficulty in this verse, but in any case it does not bear on the main topic here, which is the meaning of knowledge and wisdom.

It may be that, in spite of first impressions, the distinction between wisdom and knowledge is not too sharp. One notes that the third gift mentioned in 12:7-10 is faith. True, the popular connotations of wisdom, knowledge, and faith differ. People often contrast faith with knowledge. Yet this contrast is absent from the NT. Faith and knowledge can be considered identical, or, at least, faith is one kind of knowledge; viz., a knowledge of theology, not a knowledge of botany. Perhaps then the terms *wisdom* and *knowledge* refer only to a difference of degree, in which case the similarity would be basic. Unfortunately I Corinthians 12:7-10 does not give any explanation. Whatever information can be had

2. Reprinted by permission of the *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* (Vol. XV, Part IV).

must come from the first three or four chapters of the epistle. To them we now turn.

Whom does Paul address in his first epistle? His second epistle expressly mentions the church at Corinth with all the saints that are in the whole of Achaia. The first epistle too seems directed, not merely to the several congregations in the city of Corinth, but to other congregations also, "in every place," presumably every place in Greece. At least two verses in the first three chapters, if they do not require this inference, make better sense if so understood. The reference to Greeks in general and not just Corinthians in 1:22, and as well the *wherever* and *whenever* of 3:3-4, give some small support to the assumption of a wider public. The first of these two references is the better for this purpose because at first sight it seems strange that Paul has so much to say about wisdom and knowledge to the Corinthians. Corinth was not Oxford; it was Liverpool. Hence when he says in 1:22 that the Greeks seek after wisdom, he may have had Athens in mind. The Corinthians mostly sought after money and pleasure.

Nevertheless at the time of Paul's writing wisdom and knowledge were appropriate subjects because (as Paul says immediately after the signature, address, and blessing) God had enriched them "in all utterance and all knowledge." The translation "utterance" is poor. It is better put: "in every doctrine and in all knowledge." Meyer agrees with the KJ translation in his phrase "aptitude for speech"; and Beza wanted to translate *logos* as glossalalia. Both are mistaken. *Logos* means doctrine, reason, thought. This fits with the next term *knowledge*. It is not an unusual term in Paul's writings, or in the NT as a whole. In one place Paul uses the idea, if not always the word, five times in two verses (Eph. 1:17-18). Similarly II Peter 1:2, 3, *et passim* emphasize knowledge.

Since American Christendom (used in a loose sense), including even the semi-conservative enclaves, has little of this

emphasis, one must, in order to understand First Corinthians, rediscover the NT stress on knowledge. Paul here thanks God that the Corinthians have been made rich in all doctrine and knowledge in proportion to their growing assurance of the truth of the Gospel witness.

The apostle's remarks on wisdom and knowledge arise through his discussion of certain schisms or divisions that were occurring in the church. Led by undependable teachers, four sects had developed. Each claimed allegiance to a prominent Christian leader: Paul, Apollos, Peter, and even Christ. To head off this development Paul calls upon them all to "say the same thing, . . . and to be joined together in the same mind and in the same opinion." Whatever visible actions the schisms generated, such as holding separate meetings, electing new officers, and whatever else one can imagine from a knowledge of later church history, schism is not essentially an organizational division. The source of the difficulty in Corinth lay in what the people said and thought; that is, their opinions were the center of the evil. Therefore Paul wants them to think alike and compose their intellectual disagreements.

It should go without saying that Paul, Apollos, and Peter, not to mention Christ, had not initiated these divisions. Apollos and the two apostles agreed in doctrine, they said the same thing, they had the same mind. Paul as the writer of the epistle makes it very clear that he had done nothing to cause the present disturbance. His earlier abstention from administering the sacrament of baptism (except to three or four persons) turns out to be a fortunate circumstance, for had he shown a zeal to baptize, some might have said he baptized in his own name rather than in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Paul had spent his whole time preaching the Gospel, "not in wisdom or word, that the cross of Christ should not be made empty" (1:17).

This is the first occurrence of the word *wisdom* (*sophia*) in the epistle. The phrase is *sophia logou*. Ordinarily translated as "wisdom of word" (the plural *words* in the KJ and

ARV is incorrect, and the RSV substitutes an interpretative paraphrase), it can equally well be translated as "wisdom of doctrine," argument, definition or formula. The phrase with its several possible meanings presents a difficulty. The context has a good deal to do with baptism. Paul expressed satisfaction that he had baptized so few and hence could not be charged with substituting the doctrine of the deity of Paul for the deity of Christ. Could it be that Paul now adds, "Christ did not send me to baptize, but to preach the Gospel, not in the wisdom of a baptismal formula . . ."? *Logos* can mean formula; hence this interpretation is grammatically possible. It also fits in with the context. Though most commentators would no doubt reject this interpretation, it nonetheless seems superior to making the phrase mean "polished eloquence." *Sophia* would be a queer term to denote ornate style. Furthermore, the immediately preceding contrast between baptism and the Gospel, would be balanced by the contrast between rhetorical flourish and plain, sincere speech. This not only makes a poor balance, it is ruled out by the explicit mention of the cross of Christ. Hence "wisdom of word" must refer to some thesis or doctrine, some intellectual judgment, other than the doctrine of Atonement. This other doctrine could just possibly be the doctrine of baptism.

Although the interpretation "baptismal formula" fits in nicely with the preceding contrasts, the following paragraph suggests or even definitely fixes a different interpretation. The idea of baptism drops out. It must be regarded as entirely parenthetical. This leaves the previous reference connected solely with the rise of schism. Thus the interpretation begins with the new idea of the cross of Christ in 1:17, to be explained in 1:18-25. The parenthetical break in continuous development has the disadvantage of misleading the reader momentarily, but it is a disadvantage to be borne, for the thought of the following paragraph is quite clear.

Instead of the formula for baptism 1:18 takes up the idea of the cross of Christ and proceeds directly to the doctrine of

the Atonement. This must be noticed, for a careless reading might mislead the reader in another direction. He might conclude from the phrase "not with wisdom of doctrine" that Paul proposes a nondoctrinal anti-intellectual religion. Does not Paul here condemn all *logos* (doctrines)? Of course he does not. The following verses must be regarded as the interpretation or explanation of the short phrase in 1:17; and this explanation centers on the doctrine of the Atonement.

This doctrine is nonsense (*moria*) to the reprobate; it is the "power of God" to the elect. As the Apostle says also in II Corinthians 2:16, the savor of his knowledge is not only from life to life, but also a savor from death to death. He confirms this idea in 1:19 by quoting or adapting Isaiah 29:14, "the wisdom of their wise men shall perish and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid."³ In Isaiah the language applies to the Jewish people. Therefore the idea cannot be narrowly restricted to the Greeks. Verse 20 connects the wise man and the scribe—clearly a Jewish reference. True, in 1:22 "the Greeks seek after wisdom." This extends the meaning of Isaiah, but with all the references to wisdom in the OT Paul's thought is not limited to Greek philosophy, to Plato and Aristotle, about whom the Corinthian traders knew so little.

It should be made clear at once that Paul does not disparage wisdom and argument. He certainly teaches that neither scribal pedants nor "cooperative investigators" of this world ever brought anyone to God. These two groups thought that the Atonement was nonsense. Here can be found the source of Tertullian's contrast between Jerusalem and Athens. Their principles have nothing in common. But just as Tertullian did not on this ground despise close reasoning—his arguments prepared for and almost arrived at the Athanasian position—so Paul here condemns only the wisdom of this world and neither the wisdom of God nor the doctrine

3. Paul merely substitutes "I shall set aside" for the LXX "I shall hide."

of the Atonement. Paul does not support anti-intellectualism. It was the wisdom and intricate plan of God that prevented the world from knowing God by its own wisdom. God fore-ordained pagan philosophy and Jewish disputes for the purpose of blinding the eyes of the reprobate and hardening their hearts. He made their wisdom nonsense. But far from teaching anti-intellectualism Paul even here in this paragraph, and more clearly elsewhere, commends the wisdom of God. This wisdom is Christ, here called *Sophia* rather than *Logos*. Therefore Paul preaches the doctrine of the Atonement.

At this point, with the mention of Tertullian, one might consider what the Apostle Paul thought of Aristotle's cosmological argument for the existence of God. Nothing in the text shows that he had ever read *Metaphysics*, book Lambda. Hence the *exegete* is limited to conjecture. Thomas Aquinas held that Paul proleptically declared valid Thomas' restatement of Aristotle. From the present paragraph one would suppose that Paul regarded it as nonsense. It is strange therefore that some Christians who speak vigorously against the wisdom of this world and deprecate what they call "human logic" also are strenuous defenders of the cosmological arguments and think that the truth of God should be proved true by secular investigations.

Insofar as Paul's words can be applied to Aristotle, 3:20 would be even a clearer repudiation of philosophical speculation about God. Using the term *dialogismos* (reasonings, deliberations) the verse says, "The Lord knows that the arguments of the wise are futile." Christian apologues therefore would do well to repudiate the scholastic futility of so-called "natural theology." They should desist from attempts to prove God's existence and to describe his nature on the basis of empirical observations.

Verses 1:25 and 27 speak of weakness. God has not called many men of fleshly wisdom, nor many powerful, nor many well born. That this does not disparage wisdom as such follows from the fact that Paul does not disparage power and

good birth as such. He considered his own lineage and birth (II Cor. 11:22, Rom. 11:1, Phil. 3:4-8) a most fortunate inheritance; and his counting it as loss in comparison with Christ does not invalidate its advantages any more than his submission to the thorn in the flesh makes sickness preferable to health. In this passage Paul might have referred to wealth—indeed, wealth might be included in the ideas of powerful and well born. Now, wealth can be and often is a barrier to heaven. Yet the Bible does not condemn Abraham and Job. Thus as these advantages are not condemned as such, neither should Paul be understood to disparage wisdom, learning, or knowledge. This thought in no way contradicts the express statements that God chose what the world regarded as nonsense to shame the wise man, and the weak to shame the strong, and the ignoble to shame the well born.⁴

The chapter ends by saying either that Christ became three things in our case, *viz.*, (1) wisdom, (2) righteousness and holiness, and (3) redemption; or that Christ became a wisdom that consists of two parts, *viz.*, (1) righteousness and holiness and (2) redemption. The exact meaning is not very clear, but the grammatical construction hardly permits the interpretation that Christ became four things. At any rate wisdom is not despised.

That this wisdom is not a personal encounter as Søren Kierkegaard and Emil Brunner describe it has already been indicated by the phrase "the doctrine of the cross" (1:18). In a peculiar sense Kierkegaard himself requires a man to have a certain amount of intelligence in order to become a Christian. He holds that a man must understand doctrine x, must understand doctrine y, and must understand that x contradicts y. Then the man must throw away all his intelligence, sacrifice his intellect, and believe both parts of the contradiction.

4. Whether "things that do not exist" is in apposition with the ignoble and weak, or is in addition to them, and if in addition, what they are, is difficult to say. The omission of *hai* in P 46, Aleph, A, *et al.* against Aleph 3, B, C 3 *et al.* would favor apposition and would make very good sense.

Brunner also teaches that the Bible is self-contradictory. He argues that the doctrine of election is illogical; if we drew inferences from it, we would conclude that God is not love. One cannot have logic and a loving God, too. Hence says Brunner, "since the Bible teaches election, it is consistently inconsistent. Calvin, as opposed to the Bible, is logical and must be repudiated. His mistake was to think that theology is concerned with intelligible truth (*einsichtige Vernunftswahrheit*). Brunner further says that God and the medium of conceptuality (*Begrifflichkeit*) are mutually exclusive. None of this sounds like Paul. His denunciation of worldly wisdom is no invitation to believe contradictions.

To return now to the text itself, 2:1 says that Paul did not come preaching the mystery⁵ of God in superiority of word or wisdom.

If anyone prefers *message* to *mystery*, the point of the present article becomes easier to substantiate. Otherwise the writer must show that *mystery* is nothing "mysterious," but simply a proposition that cannot be discovered through natural theology but must be revealed by God. The reason is that instead of depending on Aristotle or Aquinas Paul decided to confine his message to the doctrine of the Atonement. This is borne out in 2:4 and 5, where the contrast between divine words and wisdom and human words and wisdom is made explicit. "My argument and my preaching," says Paul, "were not in persuasive words of wisdom,⁶ but in demonstration⁷ of spirit and power in order that your faith should not be [grounded?] in human wisdom but in divine power." The contrast is clearly not be-

5. *Mystery* is found in p 46 (apparently), the original Aleph, A, G, and a few other MSS. *Message* is found in the third hand of Aleph, B, four other uncials, and a long line of cursives.

6. The textual problem here is one of the worst in the NT. Counting variations of variations there are about a dozen readings. They need not be discussed now, for all have the same general sense.

7. Note the use of a term in logic. *Apodeixis* means: showing forth, making known, publication, exposition, proof, deductive proof by syllogism, appointment, display, achievement (the latter two meanings seem to be found mainly in the time of Herodotus and neither before nor after).

tween rationality and irrationality, but between human wisdom and divine wisdom. The pietists incline to the contrast between an intelligible message versus the power of the Spirit. They fail to give adequate attention to the fact that the power of the Spirit functions in the argument or doctrine (*logos*) and the message preached (*kerugma*). Paul's contrast lies between divine truth and false opinions based on natural theology, not between truth and nonrational power.

"We speak wisdom," writes Paul; and if wisdom is preached, proclaimed, or spoken, wisdom must consist of intellectual propositions expressed in intelligible language. These truths are mysteries, i.e., secrets that God did not tell the pagans. He kept these secrets hidden from the rulers of this world. So says the OT. Then come two or three verses that the pietists and mystics so lamentably misunderstand. The introductory words come from two passages in Isaiah. "What the eye did not see and the ears did not hear and did not enter man's heart, i.e., those things that God prepared for those who love him,⁸ God revealed to us [emphasis on *to us*] by the Spirit." The next words, the second half of 2:10, identifies these secrets as "the deep things of God."

Too frequently a pietist will use these verses to maintain a position directly contradictory to what the verses say. For example, Dr. A. W. Tozer published a sermon that Dr. Aiken Taylor strangely thought excellent enough to reprint in *The Presbyterian Journal* (February 11, 1970), a periodical supposedly devoted to the principles of the Westminster Confession. Dr. Tozer is not an advocate of natural theology. He stands at the opposite extreme, an opponent not only of natural theology but of revealed theology as well. His sermon, entitled *Revelation is Not Enough*, is basically a repudiation of the text, the words, the theology of the Bible, and a plea in favor of something to be found between the lines or behind the text. In fact he claims that the difference between

8. At this point a comma makes a better grammatical construction than does a period.

a fundamentalist who accepts what the Bible says and believes in the Deity of Christ and a modernist who rejects the message of the Bible and denies the doctrine of creation is insignificant in comparison with the difference between the acceptance of the biblical text and the search for something beyond and beneath the inspired written words.

Dr. Tozer's defense of mysticism (and he himself accepts this designation) is partly an exposition of John's Gospel⁹ and partly an appeal to the present passage in Corinthians. As to this latter he quotes beginning at the material from Isaiah. He even includes the words, "God has revealed them [in my opinion, the deep things of God] unto us." But he does not quote, and fails to take into account, and presumably denies that these deep things are precisely the *argument*, the *proclamation*, of verse 4, the *knowledge* of verse 12, and the *spoken* spiritual [words] of verse 13. What Paul here commends, Dr. Tozer dismisses as "the dead body of truth." Now, to do Dr. Tozer justice, one must acknowledge that he says some good things about the Bible, and even recommends memorization. But these good things are nullified by his explicit acceptance of mysticism.

In opposition to mysticism Paul has asserted that God revealed to us His secrets concerning the crucifixion of Christ. These secrets are the various intelligible propositions that compose the doctrine of the Atonement. Paul then, somewhat unnecessarily as some might think, defends the ability of the Spirit to make such a revelation on the ground that the Spirit is privy to all of God's thoughts. What is more germane to the present subject is the added idea in 2:11 that no one by natural theology can know the thoughts of God. A man has this knowledge only by revelation. Now, we Christians have received "the Spirit from God in order that we might know those [theological theses] which God has graciously given us. These are the doctrines we speak, not in

9. Compare my *The Johannine Logos* (second edition), pp. 74-86.

didactic words of human wisdom, but in the didactic [words] of the Spirit, explaining spiritual [matters] in spiritual [words]."

This passage shows clearly that spiritual matters can be explained in words. The words themselves are spiritual. They are also didactic. They are the words Paul spoke, and, we may add, wrote. All this fits in nicely with verbal inspiration, but is far removed from inexpressible, nonverbal, mystic experiences.¹⁰

"The psychical man does not receive the [doctrines] of the Spirit of God." This does not deny that he understands them. Before his conversion Paul understood very well what the Christians meant by calling Christ Lord. Very probably he understood it better than most Christians did. But he did not receive it as true. It was foolishness to him; even more it was blasphemy. It could have been neither, unless he had understood it. Therefore when 2:14 says, "the psychical man . . . cannot know" the divine doctrines, it is using the verb *know* in the sense of *know as true*. That this is the meaning is clear from the reason given for it: "for they are spiritually evaluated."

10. So this passage. Someone may wish to mention another passage, II Corinthians 12:2, which sounds very much like mysticism. If it were, it would even so not be normative for other Christians. They would not be compelled to go behind the text and ascend to the third heaven. This would be even less a requirement for salvation than a repetition by everyone or anyone of Paul's experiences on the road to Damascus. However, these considerations are unnecessary, for II Cor. 12:2 ff is not mysticism. Verse 4 uses the word *unspeakable* or *inexpressible*, and mystics may take what delight they can in this word. But how words (*rhemata*) can be inexpressible, let the mystics explain. The translation, however, is poor. *Arrête* is not *inexpressible*. Souter gives: "not to be uttered (because too sacred), secret." Liddell and Scott give: "unspeakable . . . that cannot be spoken . . . not to be spoken . . . unutterable . . . horrible . . . shameful to be spoken . . ." In classical Greek the word frequently had an evil meaning inappropriate to the context of II Corinthians. This context indicates which of all these meanings is to be chosen. What was revealed to Paul in this vision consisted of words (*rhemata*). They were *arrête*, not because it was an irrational emotional upset, but because they were not *lawful* (*exon*) to be spoken. *Exon* means lawful or permissible. They were divine secrets, which Paul could (no doubt easily) understand; but God commanded him not to tell these secrets to other Christians. The whole revelation is verbal and rational.

Parenthetically and perhaps repetitiously one notes that this intensive use of the verb *to know* undermines the alleged distinction between *gnosis* and *epignosis*, for in this verse the heightened sense of know is expressed with the simple, not the compound, verb.

Then in three lines the chapter ends with the assertion, "We have the mind of Christ." It does not say that we have the emotions of Christ. The "punch line" of the chapter, its climax, its last word, is a word of intellectualism, intelligibility, knowledge, and understanding. "We have the *mind* (*noun*) of Christ."

To complete the list, the only other instance of the word *sophia* in I Corinthians is 3:19. It adds no new thought. Once again it confirms the conclusion that the arguments of Aristotle, Hegel, and Wittgenstein are no more than foolishness. This conclusion includes the application to those who try to base the truth of God's Word on the secular or so-called scientific investigations of history and archaeology. Nothing in Paul suggests that the work of "cooperative investigation" (1:20) is more certain or reliable than the wisdom of God. Is it not strange that any evangelical, for whom *sola Scriptura* is the formal principle of theology, should try to base the truth of Scripture on the conclusions of Dr. Albright and Miss Kenyon? For Paul revelation is self-authenticating. Athens, Oxford, and American universities have nothing in common with Jerusalem.

3

Summary: Because of the divisions mentioned in chapter one, it is clear that the Corinthians are immature Christians. They should understand the relation between the apostles and God who sent them. Those who build on an apostle's foundation must take care how they build, for God will evaluate their work. If anyone destroys the temple building, God will destroy him. Sharp dealings with God do not pay off. Remember, you belong to Christ.

1 "And I, brethren, could not speak to you as to spiritual [persons] but as to carnal or infants in Christ."

Pneumatikōis, spiritual persons, is the word so emphatically used in 2:13, 14, 15. A man is spiritual whom the Spirit possesses, but not all regenerate persons exhibit the Spirit's working to the same degree. Some are carnal and infantile. *Nēpios*, unlike *Bréphē*, does not always mean *infant*; it is a more elastic word and applies to *youths* as well. Here, the reference to milk in the next verse indicates that infants are meant.

Sarkinois and *nēpiois* are presumably synonyms here: the latter is used to explain the former. It should be noted that the use of *nēpios* precludes the conclusion that Christians can be divided into two groups: carnal and spiritual. *Nēpios* indicates the possibility of growth, and therefore of different degrees of growth; so that there can be as many classes of Christians as there are individual Christians. At any rate, the division of all Christians into two sharply distinct categories is and results in further misunderstanding of the New Testament. See verse three.

2 "I made you drink milk, not food, for you could not yet [stand it]. You cannot even now [stand it]."

Although the Corinthian Christians were *spiritual*, be-

cause as regenerate people the Spirit had dethroned their Adamic nature; yet Paul could not speak to them as spiritual, for they were infantile. A baby is a human being, but we cannot converse in a fully human style with babies. So Paul gave them milk and not solid food.

Hebrews 5:11-14 makes the same distinction; and Hebrews 6:1-2 seems to list some of the "milk" doctrines. Repentance, faith, baptisms, ordinations (?), and the resurrection are elementary doctrines. Note that even infantile or "milk" Christianity is not nondoctrinal. Among the Corinthians, if the teaching contained not much else, it at least contained the doctrine of the Atonement. However, Paul does not want his converts to live on milk all their lives. They must progress to meat and more profound theology.

3 "For you are still *sarkikoi*."

Some commentators try to find a difference between the meaning of *sarkinoi* of verse one and the *sarkikoi* here. The fact that Paul says you are *still sarkikoi* makes it obvious that the Corinthians are still what they were: *sarkinoi*. Thus there is no difference in meaning. They were and they remain infantile.

Liddell and Scott, the best Greek lexicon in existence, acknowledges no difference between these two forms of the same word. Nor does Arndt and Gingrich. The point may not be so important here, but it bears on the Arminian understanding of Romans 7:14. Applicable at the present time is not so much the meaning of these words, but the possibility that many Christians today are carnal, immature, or infantile. Sometimes this is their own fault, and they are conceited or puffed up, as Paul describes the Corinthians in the next chapter. Sometimes the state of babyhood is the result of being fed two percent milk spiked with katabolic adulterants. Friends of mine, who would not abandon apostate churches, have not heard the Gospel for thirty years; and their children have never heard it. What we used to consider elementary, they look upon as hair-splitting pedantry that is of no value

whatever. The need today is for serious, really serious Bible study.

3b "For where among you there is zeal and strife, are you not carnal (*sarkikoi*) and do you not conduct yourselves in a [purely] human fashion?"

Some MSS insert after *strife* the words *and divisions*. Although one important papyrus and many unimportant cursives have this addition, the best uncials do not have it. The word *where* may indicate, not only that there is zeal and strife, but also that in some places these sins are absent. If Paul is addressing several congregations, even several cities, as 1:2 hinted, this makes sense, but where such strife exists, the Christians are carnal.

4-5 "For whenever one says, I am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollos, are you not men? What then is Apollos? What Paul? Servants, through whom you have believed, and to each [evangelist] as the Lord has given."

Paul, Apollos, and all other prominent preachers are servants of God. They are indeed servants in the hands of God, for, though the Corinthians came to believe through the preaching of one or the other, and so one might say Paul converted this man and Apollos another man, yet neither evangelist converted anybody. Neither gave anyone his faith. God, Himself, decided to which sinners He would give faith. Faith is a gift of God, as the epistle later says, and no apostle can give it to anyone, nor can anyone produce it voluntarily out of his own resources.

KJ unfortunately translates "to each" (*hekastō*) as "to every man." This gives the impression that God gave faith to every man in the Corinthian church. Well, of course, God did exactly that. However, the section concerns the evangelists, and the *each* refers to them. Not only did God choose which sinners He would endow with faith, He also chose which and how many sinners would be converted under the preaching of each preacher. The following confirms this.

6 "I planted, Apollos watered; but God caused the growth."

The assignment of converts to one man rather than to another is not so sharp as the paragraph above may seem to say. True enough, some men received their faith upon the occasion of Paul's preaching. Even so, if Paul planted the Word of God, Apollos came a little later and watered it; and God caused the growth.

In contrast with Paul's modesty, or more clearly, in contrast with Paul's recognition of his role as a servant, some modern evangelists publicize the great number of decisions they have produced, or, what is equally bad, they refer the conversions to the will of the convert. These popular evangelists forget that salvation is of the Lord. As Psalm 65:4 says, "Blessed is the man whom thou choosdest and caushest to approach unto thee."

7 "Consequently neither the one who plants is anything [important], nor the one who waters, but God who causes the growth."

Again, for emphasis, this verse says that salvation is of the Lord. Man is nothing; God is all.

8 "He who plants and he who waters are one, and each shall receive his own reward in proportion to his own trouble."

This verse shows that there are greater and lesser rewards, as John 19:11 shows that there are greater and lesser sins, and as Luke 12:47-48 predicts greater and lesser punishments. The rewards here are not said to be merited by the hard labor, for after we have done all that is commanded we are still unprofitable servants; but grace apportions the rewards to the work.

9 "For we are God's coworkers; you are God's farm, God's building."

The first phrase of this verse does not mean, as KJ seems to say, that the apostles are fellow workers together with God, as if God were one of the collaborators. Much less does it mean that the Corinthian Christians are fellow laborers with anybody. The paragraph has to do with the apostles, Peter and Paul, and some other prominent leaders such as Apollos.

The point is that these men, who work together, are one in being all servants of God; and therefore none of them is particularly important, for it is God who causes the work to succeed.

This interpretation is not "linguistically erroneous," as Meyer claims, for the threefold division is clear: God, the evangelists, and the converts. Nor do 1 Thessalonians 3:2, Romans 16:3, 9, 21, and Philippians 2:25, 4:3 contradict this interpretation; but on the contrary they tend to confirm it. Hodge also seems to make the same mistake. It is the leaders who are fellow workers with each other.

The Corinthians on the other hand are God's farm or building. In this chapter, Paul had used the figure of planting and watering; but from here on he changes to the figure of a building or temple.

10 "According to the grace of God given to me, I have, like a wise architect, laid a foundation; another is building on it. Let each one take care how he builds."

One should not suppose that Paul had only Apollos in mind when he speaks of another builder. Looking into the future, Paul knows well that there will be many builders. Each one is to take care.

11 "For no one can lay a different foundation other than the one laid, which is Christ."

The foundation of the building is Christ, for the building is the Church; and the Church cannot possibly have any other foundation. This is why—3:11 is a reason for the preceding—one must take care. One must take care not to use wood, hay, and stubble. As the foundation Paul laid was obviously the doctrine he preached, the Atonement, so too, later building materials are doctrines, good or bad. If someone adds bad doctrines, they will be burned up like straw.

A modern reader, however, may be puzzled how the foundations of the Church can be both the person of Christ and a theological doctrine. Yet, remember, Christ said that upon this rock, not Peter, but the doctrine of the Deity of

Christ, I will build my Church. One must not separate the person of Christ from the theology. It is common to think of a person as something different from his mind. People say, "I have a mind." Is it not better to say, "I am this mind." Are you not your mind? If not, what are you? Now, a mind is what it thinks. If there were no thought, there would be no mind. The "person" would be "mindless"; that is, there would be neither person nor mind. Christ *thien* is what He thinks. He is the Wisdom and Logos of God. This Logos, including the Atonement, the Deity of Christ, and all the other divine truths (God is truth), is the foundation on which we are to build. Therefore, take heed.

12-13 "For if anyone erects on the foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, straw, the work of each will become apparent, for the day will make it evident; because it will be revealed by fire, and each one's work, whatever it is, the fire will put to the test."

The inferior building materials, designated as wood, hay, and straw, are of different sorts. In these first four chapters, Paul faces a complex situation, with differences arising chiefly from two factors: These two factors are heresy and factionalism. In the first two chapters, the main subject is heresy. Here, Paul contrasted the doctrine of the Atonement with pagan philosophy. In the next two chapters, there is more emphasis on the attack against Paul's apostolic authority. A minor complicating factor is the distinction between false teachers and the ordinary church members. The latter, or at least some of them, were doing wrong, though their sin was not so heinous as that of the former. Hence Paul's phraseology has degrees of application. In the present verse, the wood, hay, and stubble can hardly mean heresies as serious as the denial of the Atonement, for the stubble is pictured as erected on the foundation of Christ. Hence Paul seems to refer to lesser aberrations. They are certainly weak spots that harm the solidity of the building. Paul gives no examples here. One might suggest instant sanctification,

prayers for the dead, free will, salvation by works during the millennium, and other nonscriptural doctrines that hinder the progress of the Gospel.

The value, or, better, the disvalue of these doctrines will be revealed by fire at the day of judgment when the Lord with His angels shall be revealed in flaming fire, and the world will be destroyed with intense heat (II Thess. 1:8 and II Pet. 3:10).

14-15 "If anyone's work remains, which he has built, he shall receive a reward. If anyone's work is burned up, he shall be punished; but he himself shall be saved, even though it is through fire."

These verses confirm the interpretation of the preceding. Paul is not speaking of seriously antichristian doctrines, such as those that cause him to pronounce anathemas on the Judaizers. The unbiblical teachers here in mind will themselves be saved, even though they have damaged the temple of God. Ignorantly and carelessly though they have built, yet they built on the foundation of the Atonement. Therefore, though they shall be punished, they are at the end received into heaven.

It should be noted that Paul is expressly speaking of ministers, not of their converts. No doubt certain implications for the laity can be drawn, but the leaders bear the greater responsibility in building the Church.

16-17 "Don't you realize that you are the temple of God and the Spirit of God dwells in you? If anyone destroys the temple of God, God will destroy him; for the temple of God is holy, which you are."

These two verses, in the form of a conclusion to the previous fifteen verses, serve as a warning and rebuke to those who are making trouble in Corinth. The first idea in this conclusion is not that each individual Christian is a temple of God in whom the Spirit dwells. It is the Church that is the temple.

Nor is it likely that Paul is identifying the temple with

the church at Corinth, as if there were another temple at Ephesus and another at Rome. The NAS is probably wrong in translating the phrase as "you are a temple of God." The KJ is more probably correct because nothing in the whole context refers to several "churches." The grammar neither prevents the use of the definite article in English nor requires the indefinite. *Naos* (temple) is a predicate nominative preceding the verb. Only if an anarthrous predicate nominative follows the verb in Greek is the indefinite article required in English. There is therefore but one Church, the Church universal.

The Spirit then dwells in the temple, and hence the destruction of the temple (here *naos* is not predicate nominative and the definite article is explicit) entails the destruction of the destroyer.

The KJ seems to be mistaken as to the meaning of the last three words of verse 17. It says, "which temple ye are." However, this meaning would require the relative pronoun in the singular, to agree with *temple*. The relative is plural and agrees with *you*. Hence the meaning is, you are holy as the temple is. More literally: [of] which [character] you are.

18 "Let no one deceive himself. If anyone among you thinks he is wise in this world, let him become a fool that he may become wise."

The warning and conclusion continue. The thought, however, refers back to the account of wisdom in chapter two. Therefore this verse should not be translated as "wise in this age," as if to compare this age with a coming Messianic age—as the NAS does—for presumptions of wisdom in the Messianic age would be equally reprehensible. The next verse is decisive on the meaning.

19-20 "For the wisdom of this world is nonsense before God; for it is written, He who catches the wise in their devices, and again, The Lord knows that the arguments of the wise are vain."

The phrase "this world" (*kosmion tauton*) shows how "this age" (*aiōn*) of the previous verse should be understood;

and the unmistakable reference to the *wisdom* of chapter two reinforces the point. Furthermore, Paul supports his assertion with quotations from Job 5:13 and Psalm 94:11, and these clearly concern the present world, not a future Messianic age.

"Yours" must refer to the troublemakers, the leaders and their followers, for throughout Paul has them chiefly in view. However, clearly the reference also extends beyond them to all the Corinthian Christians. The apostle is stating a relationship that holds between the Church and the rest of the universe. The Corinthians and Christians everywhere must not boast about belonging to Paul or Peter as their leader. Rather Paul, Peter, and Apollos belong to them. Not only are the apostles their servants, but all things belong to the Church; that is, God works all things for the good of the Church (Rom. 8:28), and the Church, the heir of the world (Rom. 4:13) shall judge angels and all things (see later in 6:3). In the light of this world-wide and all-time economy, the troublemakers stand condemned.

It was also necessary to say that Christ was God's. This last phrase does not contradict the doctrine of the Trinity. After all, Christ is the Son of the Father, and this expresses some sort of subordination. Similar phrases occur in 11:3 and 15:28. The subordination is functional or "economic" as some theologians call it, not essential. However, it was necessary to say that Christ was God's because the claim "I belong to Christ," taken by itself, cannot be wrong. However, when it is used to break up the Church, it is as bad as the other claims—perhaps even worse because it suggests a more obnoxious pride. Hence Paul constructs the steps of "ownership"—the apostles are yours, you are Christ's, and Christ is God's.

On this great solemn and transcendent note, the chapter ends.

Summary: The preceding argument prohibits arrogance on the part of the apostles and all the more prohibits arrogance on the part of other Christians.

1 "On this principle let a man consider us [the apostles] as servants of Christ and stewards of God's mysteries."

The principle is of course that of the previous chapter. The apostles are servants or stewards. The implication is that the party leaders must also consider themselves as servants. The mysteries they dispense are not the sacraments, for *mysterion* is never applied to a sacrament. A mystery is a revealed doctrine. God's servants must dispense these doctrines to the Church. The verse undercuts the claims of the papal establishment.

2-3 "Such being the case, for the rest, it is requisite in the case of stewards that they be found trustworthy. For me, however, it is immaterial that I should be judged by you or by [any] human day. I do not even judge myself."

The words *human day* here are very peculiar, but clearly the idea is that of a human judgment in contrast with the day of the Lord.

4 "For I am conscious to myself of nothing, yet I am not justified by this [fact], but he who judges me is the Lord."

Before Luther and Calvin had introduced the grammatical method of exegesis, even the great Augustine detached the first phrase of this verse from its context, and, anticipating the KJ translation, said, "I know nothing by myself." This he worked into the theory of epistemology that all learning, whether by a regenerate or an unregenerate man, depends on the Logos who enlightens every man who comes into the world. Augustine's epistemology is excellent, and his *de*

Magistro, especially the second half, is recommended reading; but his use of this verse is deplorable. There is nothing here about a general theory of knowledge. The matter concerns the question whether or not Paul has committed some great sin or blunder.

The phrase "I am conscious of nothing with respect to myself," if taken with extreme literalness, either in Greek or English, would mean: I am conscious that I have done no wrong. No human being can be so conscious; not merely because everyone knows he has done something wrong in the last ten years, but because he cannot know that he has done everything right in the last twenty-four hours. We often, perhaps usually, do wrong without knowing it. A textual reason against this interpretation is that if such a consciousness existed, the man would indeed be justified; but Paul immediately adds, "yet I am not justified by this fact." Hence the phrase must mean: "I am not conscious of any wrong-doing."

Naturally this does not refer to all of his previous life. Paul was acutely conscious that he had done wrong in persecuting the early Church. The wrong the verse refers to would be a wrong or blunder done in his Corinthian ministry. He was not conscious that he had made any mistake in founding the church in Corinth. Nor is the justification mentioned God's justification of the sinner by faith alone. The justification that his consciousness does not produce has to do with his conduct as a steward. For these reasons, the verse does not teach a doctrine of complete, instantaneous perfection, but merely says that Paul made no ministerial blunders in Corinth.

Believing, and probably with good reason, that he had made no blunders, Paul cares nothing for human evaluations of his conduct. Those who oppose him and condemn him are wrong, but beyond this, though not so immediately applicable to the situation, is the fact that he is the steward or servant of the Lord, and it is the Lord, not the Corinthians, who will judge his performance.

Note parenthetically that *Lord* is here a predicate nominative placed before the verb. Therefore it does not have the definite article. This bears on the claim to Deity in John 1:1, which Jehovah's Witnesses deny.

5 "Consequently do not judge anything prematurely, before the Lord comes, who will both shed light on the hidden things of darkness and make evident the purposes of hearts; and then the praise will be given to each by God."

The Corinthians cannot see the hearts and motives of either Paul or the troublemakers. They cannot see each other's motives. How this denies them an ability to judge correctly is obvious. This principle applies to contemporary congregations too, not only with respect to their leaders, but also with respect to receiving new members into their fellowship. Some congregations claim to receive as new members only those who have been born again. The members must be regenerate, but this is an impossible ideal. One minister said that God had given him the gift of seeing other men's hearts, and therefore all his people were regenerate—whereas our inferior congregation could not measure up to his standard. The minister in question later abandoned his wife, split his church in two, and ran off with another woman. Our "inferior" congregation accepts new members upon a credible profession of faith in Christ. Our elders can judge only of what the candidates tell them. Candidates vary in age and intelligence. Some may not know what the words of a profession mean; some may just possibly be conscious hypocrites; but if they sound sincere and if they seem to understand, we receive them as communicant members.

6 "These things brethren, I have adapted to myself and Apollos because of you, in order that you might learn by us the [principle] 'Not beyond what is written. . . .'"

Here there is a slight break, a new paragraph, where, because Paul uses the word *brethren*, some commentators think that Paul now turns from berating the party leaders and addresses the Corinthians in general. This is not a necessary

conclusion. At any rate, it is hardly accurate to say that Paul now addresses his readers as *brethren* "with a winning warmth of feeling." There may indeed be some warmth, but in verses 7, 8, 9, and 10, it is the warmth of biting sarcasm.

The point that Paul has ceased from speaking to the leaders and now addresses all the brethren should not be overemphasized. In one sense, all the preceding argument is directed to the Corinthians in general, for they are the addressees. It may even be that *brethren* could be a hint of this, but then Paul might address the leaders as brethren, if he thought they were not completely irredeemable.

First, however, "these things" in 4:6 refer to the particulars of the situation described in the previous chapter and the principles Paul used to judge them. It may be noted too that although Peter and Christ were mentioned in chapter one as reputed leaders of two parties, the repeated reference to Apollos implies that his party was the worst. Not that Apollos was to blame. Here, Paul associates Apollos with himself in deploring the fractures in the society.

KJ translates the last part of the verse as, "that ye might learn in us not to think of men above that which is written." RSV says, "that you may learn by us to live according to Scripture." Both are poor translations, though RSV has the better sense. KJ errs by using the verb *think*, which is not found in the text, and also by inserting the phrase *of men*. This insertion limits the scope of the principle. To be sure, the context has to do with judging men in Corinth; but the principle to which Paul appeals is broader, and here RSV gives the good interpretation of "live according to Scripture." Though it is a good interpretation, why should not the translation more accurately say, "that by us [or, in our case] you might learn the [principle] 'not beyond what is written'?"

The Corinthians, perhaps unwittingly, had followed norms of judgment that had not been revealed. Paul insists that they confine themselves to "what is written," certainly referring to the Old Testament and possibly to as much of

the New Testament as then existed. This is the so-called Puritan principle: the Bible alone and the Bible in its entirety is the Word of God written, and to it nothing may be added nor from it may anything be taken away. One reason for this immediately follows.

6b "in order that one should not be puffed up for the one [Apollus?] against the other [Peter?]."

A person who thinks he has doctrines or principles of action in addition to what is written is conceited. Allow one man to legislate and every man must be granted the same authority. Then one conceited preacher attacks another conceited preacher. There are other and doubtless more important applications of the principle of "Scripture alone," but the application to conceit is pertinent.

Hodge has tried to explain the verse as meaning, "Be not puffed up one above another," and he refers to I Thessalonians 5:11. However, there *heis ton hena* is in the accusative; here *hyper tou henos* is genitive, and the genitive means *in behalf of*. Further *hyper* is contrasted with *kata*: *for* and *against*. Finally, if Paul has indeed paid more attention here to the ordinary members, and less to the leaders, to whom he might well have said, "Don't be puffed up one above another," if, I say, he is addressing the ordinary members, he must be urging them not to be puffed up on behalf of one leader against another.

7 The translation of the first phrase here depends on how the argument is to be understood. KJ says, "Who maketh thee to differ from another?" NAS has, "Who regards you as superior?" Then the verse continues, "What do you have that you did not receive? And if you received it, why do you boast as if you had not received it?"

Strangely, Paul uses the singular in the first phrase, as if he were addressing a single individual. Perhaps this is a device to press the question on each reader. In the previous verse, Paul had used the plural.

"Who makes you different?" One commentator assumes

a negative answer to this rhetorical question. No one makes you different; hence your pride is unfounded. However, this does not quite fit in with the remainder of the verse, and it is utterly at variance with chapter twelve, as we shall see. Let us then say rather, there are indeed differences, though not the superiority the Corinthians imagine; and in any case it is God who distributes the differences so that no one has reason to boast.

NAS does not give a good sense: "Who regards you as superior?" The word *regards* misses the sense, for the verb requires a causative interpretation: Who *makes* you superior? Whether the word *superior* is used (the poorer sense), or the word *different*, the answer in any case is God.

8 "You are already glutted; you are already rich; you reign without us."

Not only do the factionalists boast of superiority, they have become kings in the Messianic kingdom and have left the apostles out. The sarcasm is obvious, and the last phrase of the verse clinches the point.

8b "Would indeed that you had become kings that we also might be reigning with you." This bitter sarcasm puts the Corinthians to shame.

9 "For I think God has set forth us apostles [in] last [place], condemned to death, in that we have become a spectacle to the world, both to angels and men."

The meaning of this verse is otherwise clear, but some raise a question whether all angels, good and bad, are meant, or whether only good angels are meant. In favor of the latter is the fact that the word *angels*, standing alone, never refers to all angels, nor to evil angels, but always refers to good angels alone. Nevertheless, the apostles were a spectacle to good and evil men, and perhaps more to the evil who disbelieved than to the good who understood.

10 "We are morons for Christ's sake, but you are sagacious in Christ; we are weak, but you are strong; you are highly honored, but we are despised."

The sarcasm continues: Note that while Paul could call himself a moron for Christ's sake, even sarcasm cannot be stretched to call the factions sagacious *for Christ's sake*. Their motives were different, and Paul tones down his language to *in Christ* (*dia Christon* versus *en Christo*).

11-13 The sarcasm now turns into dreadful literal statement: "To this present hour we are hungry and thirsty, we lack clothes, we are beaten, and we are homeless. We labor, working with our own hands; being reviled, we bless; persecuted, we endure it. Being defamed, we entreat [call for help?]. We have become the dishwater of the world, the scrapings of all things, to the present moment."

Comment can only becloud the meaning and weaken the force of this appalling and pathetic passage.

14-16 "I do not write these things putting you to shame, but admonishing you as my beloved children; for though you may have ten thousand tutors in Christ, yet [you do] not [have] many fathers, for by Christ Jesus through the Gospel I have begotten you. I beseech you therefore to imitate me."

Paul is coming to the end of his argument on factionalism. This is the final appeal that they agree in doctrine and not split the church with heresy. In addition to the rational argument for this, Paul now urges them to remember that he is their father; other tutors are not. The Corinthians should therefore imitate him.

Yet though Paul claims to be their father in one sense, he is careful to qualify the claim. He did not really beget them; he did not regenerate them. They were regenerated *by Christ* through Paul's preaching the Gospel.

17 "For this reason I sent Timothy to you, who is my beloved and faithful son in the Lord, who will remind you of my ways in Christ, as I teach everywhere in the whole Church."

Paul continues his personal and theological appeal for unity. "For this reason" does not mean "because I am your

father." Of course, there is the personal context that since Paul is the father of Timothy as well as of the Corinthians, the latter should receive the former as their brother; but the reason Paul sent Timothy was to restore unity to the fragmented Corinthians. To aid in this purpose, Timothy will refresh their now faint memories of Paul's methods of operation in the Lord's work. These methods Paul used everywhere in the whole Church.

18-19 "On the assumption I am not coming to you, some of you are puffed up; but I shall come quickly to you, if the Lord will; and I shall know, not the word of these conceited people, but their force."

The factional leaders had spread the rumor that Paul was afraid to return to Corinth. This strengthened their conceited claims, but, subject to divine foreordination, Paul will indeed return and will know or test, not the words and boasts of the false leaders, but their power. Here, *logos* should not be translated *doctrine*, for this gives the impression of something like the doctrine of regeneration or justification; it is; however, a sort of teaching, but the teaching of a claim. The *word* then is the claim of the false teachers to be superior to Paul. Note that in the preceding sections, Paul is defending his personal apostolic authority. He and no one else is the father of the Corinthian church. Neither the doctrine of the Atonement, nor the worldly wise remain in view here. The power or strength that Paul will test is not the power to work miracles nor a strength of virtue, both of which Paul's rivals presumably lacked, but their power and force in extending the kingdom of God.

20-21 "For the kingdom of God does not exist in word, but in power. What do you want? Shall I come to you with a rod or in love and the Spirit of gentleness?"

If Paul is going to test the power of his rivals in extending the kingdom of God, the implication is that the kingdom of God is the Church, for only the expansion of the Church can be observed. It obviously cannot be a millennial kingdom.

"Spirit of gentleness" need not be understood as some indefinite subjective mood of Paul, as modern connotations and the NAS would have it; but rather the Holy Spirit described by one of His attributes. There are several places in the New Testament where it is difficult to determine whether the Holy Spirit is meant or the subjective spirit of a man. Some comparison may help in deciding the present case. In John 15:26 and 16:13, and 1 John 4:6, the definite article occurs, and this explicitly necessitates the interpretation of the Holy Spirit, but does the absence of the article here forbid us to think of the Holy Spirit? Romans 8:15, without the article, would be nonsense if translated as "a spirit of adoption." This instance is all the more forceful in view of the immediately preceding phrase, "a spirit of servitude." If Corinthians 4:13 surely refers to the Holy Spirit and not to a subjective mental state, though even with the definite article the NAS wants to make it subjective. Does this suggest a tendency to reduce the number of references to the Holy Spirit? If there were such a tendency, it is natural that they would so consider the present verse. Ephesians 1:17 requires no stretching of the sense to have it refer to the Holy Spirit. In fact, could "spirit of revelation" ever mean a man's subjective state? Yet, that is the NAS interpretation. If Timothy 1:7, when it speaks of "a spirit of timidity," seems to mean a subjective state of mind. Modern thought is averse to the idea of an objective spirit of timidity. A spirit of power, love, and prudence can also be understood as a subjective mental state, but the latter can equally well be understood as the Holy Spirit who gives power. In Romans 8:15, it may be possible to save the objective reference of even the "Spirit of servitude" as referring to the demons of 1 Corinthians 10:21. No doubt there are New Testament verses that speak of the spirit of a man; but one must not be hasty in ruling out the Holy Spirit.

Thus, Paul completes his denunciation of heretical, anti-apostolic leaders; this ends his exhortation that the Corinthians be of one mind, one judgment, and say the same things:

5

Summary: Your church harbors a case of marriage within the prohibited degrees of affinity. This is incest. It is a sin. Instead of being so complacent, you Corinthians should excommunicate the man.

I. "It is everywhere heard that. . . ."

The NAS has chosen a poorer meaning: "it is actually reported. . . ." *Holōs* can be translated *everywhere, entirely, actually, absolutely, speaking generally*. Paul's meaning is that the case is well known, notorious, public. To say that it is "actually reported" gives the impression that not many people know it yet. The following condemnation, however, is based on the fact that the Corinthian church knew it quite well and were complacent about it.

1b. ". . . there is fornication among you, and such fornication as does not occur among the heathen, that someone has his father's wife."

The sin is neither ordinary fornication nor adultery, but something much worse than these. Fornication and adultery were common in Corinth—it was a city of prostitutes; but the incest in the church was a sin even the Corinthian pagans abominated. Even unwitting incest brought tragedy to Oedipus.

"To have a woman" in the New Testament regularly means to be married to her. This is not true of Diogenes Laertius, II 75. However, in the New Testament, even John 4:18 is not a clear-cut exception. The woman had had five men (i.e., husbands), and presumably there were legal ceremonies in these five cases. "Him whom you now have is not your man." Perhaps in this case, there was no ceremony at all. Nevertheless it was not a case of promiscuity or prostitution. It could be called a common-law marriage, and of course, it was not incest.

The sin in Corinth was incest. Leviticus 18:8 ff. prohibits incest, not only with blood relatives, but also with one's step-mother, half-sister, their children, the wife of an uncle, a daughter-in-law, a brother's wife, and some others.

Now, Paul does not explicitly appeal to this Old Testament legislation, but on what other basis could he condemn this relationship? No arguments from empirical observation can establish any moral principle. Let anyone who wishes try to formulate a syllogism to show that one should not marry his aunt (even though his aunt were a blood relation) or his daughter-in-law. Nor could Paul base his morality on Greek sensibilities, even though they agreed with him on this particular point. A moral principle can only be a divinely revealed prohibition or command, and Paul could find these only in the Old Testament. There is nothing in the New Testament concerning such marriages. A Christian must either accept these Old Testament norms on incest or acknowledge none at all.

What this implies as to the relation of the Old Testament to the New Testament is most important in other matters also. Some Christian groups prohibit the use of musical instruments in worship services because the New Testament does not authorize them. The Old Testament does. Baptists generally deny that infants are included in the Abrahamic Covenant because the New Testament does not say so. Presbyterians think that the New Testament clearly implies it, but at any rate the Old Testament is explicit. Certainly the New Testament is more explicit on infant baptism than on the immorality of marrying the wife of your mother's brother or your deceased brother's wife.

To those who disparage the Old Testament, it must be embarrassing that Paul is so vehement. He not only condemns the man; he chiefly condemns the church. From II Corinthians 7:12, we may infer that the church repented of its complacency. The further inference of several commentators that the man was still alive when Paul wrote II Corinthians

cannot be made very clear from the text. He may have been.

2 "And you are puffed up. . . ."

Complacent is really too weak a word. The Corinthians actually congratulated themselves on being so broad-minded, tolerant, or even compassionate as to welcome homosexuals. This is not compassion. This is conceit and arrogance.

2b ". . . and have not rather mourned to the extent of removing from your midst the man who did this thing."

Obviously, Paul wanted the church to exercise discipline, and few twentieth century churches do so.

3-5. "For I, absent in the body but present in the spirit, have, in the name of our Lord Jesus, already. . . ."

This is such a complicated sentence that it is more appropriate to explain the grammatical difficulties before finishing the translation. There are two possible ways to construe it, and both are awkward. The first difficulty lies in the verb *kekriika*. What had Paul already done? Had he already *condemned* the man? Or had he already *decided* to hand him over to Satan? Ordinarily, the verb means *to condemn*, with an accusative noun as object. So construed, the text would say, "I have already condemned the man who did this." The object is separated from the verb by only two words, "as if present." Without question, this would be the translation if the remainder of the sentence could somehow be fitted in.

The difficulties with this construction are, first and mainly, how to introduce the infinitive "to hand over"—can it depend on the genitive absolute? Second, there is the theological difficulty whether a congregation or only an apostle can hand over a man to Satan (cf. I Tim. 1:20).

The intervening phrases, taken alone, cause little trouble. "In the name of our Lord Jesus" goes with the preceding "I have judged (or, decided)"; and the phrase "with the power of our Lord Jesus" attaches to "you being assembled." However, can we defend the translation "I have condemned this man . . . when you are assembled to hand him over to Satan"?

The second construction uses the less frequent meaning of *kekrika* and reads: "I have decided . . . to hand over such a person to Satan." This translation would also unquestionably be correct, if only the infinitive were not three lines, twenty-six words, after the main verb. This is awkward, and to bridge the gap, the commentators who do it this way consider "such a one" (*ton toionouton*) to be a repetition of the earlier "him who did this." This is possible, but one would hope for something smoother. However, Paul writes complicated sentences, and when there are substantial grammatical difficulties with one translation, we must not allow the aesthetics of style to be the controlling factor. Thus the translation must be:

3-5 "For I, absent in the body but present in the spirit, have, in the name of our Lord Jesus, already decided, with respect to him who has done this thing, when you and my spirit are assembled together with the power of our Lord Jesus, to hand over such a man to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, in order that the spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord."

In addition to the grammar, the theology and the legal aspects of the situation require some attention. Whether or not a congregation also or an apostle only could hand over a man to Satan, the verse seems to say that Paul had already made a judicial decision before the case came to trial.

Today, if any minister voices a complaint against someone, he is confronted with Matthew 18:15. When Clarence Edward Macartney asked the Philadelphia Presbytery to request the New York Presbytery to investigate Harry Emerson Fosdick, the liberals all stood up on their hind legs and told how unscriptural it would be for them to vote for Macartney's motion until Macartney had personally interviewed Fosdick. "I would vote for this motion," said one luckless liberal, "if only Dr. Macartney had observed the scriptural regulations!" Macartney then produced the extensive correspondence he had had with Fosdick and the liberals collapsed in embarrassed silence. However, strictly speaking, there is no

injunction to follow this procedure in cases of public sin. Matthew is speaking about one man's trespass against another individual. The matter is a private one: a case of personal affront. The regulation does not apply to public heresy.

The Corinthian sinner had not personally affronted Paul; nor was he accused of heresy; but his sin was public. The context shows that it was so well known that the fact did not need to be further established. This would explain an immediate sentencing. Then, too, there is the matter of apostolic authority. Perhaps an apostle had the authority to condemn a man before the trial took place, and could remain absent in the body even during the later trial.

However, if Paul had already pronounced judgment, what was left for the Corinthian assembly to do? Other references in the New Testament seem to indicate that only an apostle and not an assembly could hand over a man to Satan to destroy his flesh. If this means death, then obviously the man was not alive in II Corinthians 7:12. Peter inflicted the death penalty in Acts 5:1-11. In Acts 13:9-11, Paul condemned Elymas to blindness. There is some difference, however. Peter did not hand over Ananias in order that he might be saved. Paul did. Perhaps this is why the text says, "for the destruction of the flesh," instead of "for the destruction of the body." In both phrases, bodily punishment is envisaged; but as "flesh" is a word the New Testament uses to characterize our sinful nature, whereas "body" would here be a literal and morally neutral word, it would seem that Paul did not pronounce a death penalty, but inflicted some physical infirmity to last until the man repented.

Then what was left for the assembly to do? Well, they had to purge themselves of their sinful conceit and arrogance. They had to demonstrate their recognition and correct evaluation of incest. This they could do in a formal congregational meeting by excommunicating the man.

6 "Your boasting is not good." The trouble was that the Corinthians boasted about their tolerant views on incest.

Possibly the events unfolded in this order: first, Paul decided to hand over the man to Satan, then the assembly met as here directed by Paul; they excommunicated him, and at this act, God inflicted Paul's punishment.

6b "Do you not know that a little leaven leavens the whole lump?" The leaven here is not the man in question concretely considered. It might even be better to take it as the boasting. However, the next two verses show that Paul is now speaking abstractly. The leaven illustrates sin in general. The Church should avoid sin, not just this one sin.

7 "Purge out the old leaven in order that you may be a new lump, as you are [in principle] unleavened."

The Corinthians were Christians, saints but not saintly, perfect but gross sinners, unleavened but full of corruption. This verse, so clear on this point, aids the interpretation of other verses where the Scripture speaks of people as if they were perfect. The reason the Corinthians were—in principle—clean, is now stated.

7b "For indeed Christ our Passover has been sacrificed." Obviously, if the Passover has been celebrated, the old leaven had been removed a few days before. This much, the immediate sense, hardly needs explanation, but it is well to note some implications that go beyond the immediately obvious. The first thing to do in studying the Scripture is to determine the meaning of the text, but then one must compare it with other texts that say much the same thing, and then with other texts that have a more or less distant relationship to the subject. Thus may a doctrine be formulated and its further implications be drawn.

The sacrifice of Christ, so briefly mentioned here, is more fully described in the Gospels and more fully explained in Romans. Here, the sacrifice is connected with cleansing from sin; its vicarious nature and its satisfaction of divine justice is elsewhere stated.

8 "Consequently let us keep the feast not with the old leaven nor with the leaven of evil and wickedness, but with the unleavened [bread] of sincerity and truth."

This is not an exhortation to celebrate the Lord's Supper. It is a conclusion from the connection between the Passover, Christ's death, and cleansing from sin. The conduct of the Corinthians had been inconsistent with the significance of the Atonement. Evil and wickedness are here contrasted with sincerity and truth. Therefore, the Corinthians must cleanse themselves.

9 "I wrote to you in the letter. . . ." This indicates that Paul had written a previous letter. Some critics assert that Paul wrote four letters to Corinth. For example:

"In II Corinthians 2:3-4 and 7:8, he mentions a 'severe letter,' the description of which coheres neither with the letter mentioned in I Corinthians [5:9-11] nor with I Corinthians itself. Some scholars believe . . . that parts of these communications have been preserved. . . . In II Corinthians 6:14-7:1 rudely interrupts the text. When this passage is removed, the material before it fits perfectly with what follows. . . . It seems reasonable to conclude that the intruding passage is a fragment of the letter referred to in I Corinthians. . . . There are other places . . . where breaks occur. . . . Although there is no MS support for the four-letters-to-Corinth proposal, it is preferable to accepting I and II Corinthians as they are. . . ."

This is a typical, not-too-extreme example of the liberal use of unfettered imagination. When the liberal cannot understand the connection between two chapters, he fabricates, without the least bit of MS evidence, whatever suits his fancy. Anything is "preferable to accepting I and II Corinthians as they are"! Note that Hebrews 5:11-6:20 is a long parenthesis that could be omitted and 5:10 would fit perfectly into 7:1, but shall we conclude that the parenthesis is an interpolation from some unknown source?

9b-10 " . . . not to associate with fornicators, not absolutely with the fornicators of this world, or the greedy and

thieves, or idolaters, since then you would have to leave the world [altogether]."

Although the case under discussion was one of incest, Paul uses the term "fornicators" (*pornoi*). Of course, incest is a kind of fornication, since a biblical marriage cannot there exist. However, in classical Greek *pornoi* frequently, even usually, refers to homosexuals. Other passages, for example, Romans 1:24, 26-27, very explicitly condemn homosexuals. For many years, even centuries, the Church has had little cause to apply these prohibitions in cases of discipline, for there was little or no such sin within the Church, but now, in the end of the twentieth century, the apostate denominations are not only condoning unnatural vice, they even form homosexual congregations. If these denominations were not apostate, if they were Christian, they would preach hell fire and warn these dregs of depraved humanity that against them the wrath of God is revealed from heaven, and perhaps by God's grace induce them to cleanse their filth by the blood of Christ.

The command not to associate with such people is not absolute or without qualification. In one's everyday business, it is impossible to avoid all such associations. So long as Christians are in the world, they cannot escape dealing with all sorts of people. Remember that Christ did not pray that we be taken out of the world, but that we should be kept from evil. The command in I Corinthians, on the contrary, forbids the Church to have fornicators, homosexuals, incestuous persons in its membership. The command also covers other sinners: thieves and idolaters. Hodge remarks that this is the earliest known instance of the use of the word *eidōlatrēs*. Liddell and Scott give no earlier instance.

11 "But now I wrote to you not to associate if anyone called a brother be a fornicator, or greedy, or an idolater, or a reviler, or a drunk, or a thief; nor even to eat with such a person."

This is somewhat repetitious. The verb "I wrote," which

could be stretched in translation to "I write," because of the word "now," presumably means, not a previous letter, but the previous verse. Paul wants the meaning of 5:9-10 to be perfectly clear.

The main idea is that the prohibition relates to professing Christians. Christ ate with the Pharisees, but obviously not so as to give the impression they were Christians. The command here is to avoid eating with professed Christians who commit these sins. II John 10 is similar.

12-13 "For why should I judge those outside [the Church]? Do you not judge those within? God will judge those outside. Excommunicate the evil man from among you."

With reference to 5:3, note that here too *krikein* has its usual meaning of *judge*. The sentence is not so much a reason for what Paul has just said, but rather for what he has not said. After his insistence on discipline in the Church, someone might ask Paul about judging the even worse sinners outside. Paul replies that God will take care of them. This idea also supports Paul's refusal to prohibit conducting ordinary business with unbelievers. The phrase "Do you not judge those within?" may seem strange in view of the fact that the Corinthians had not judged the incestuous member, but probably in the recent past, they had exercised some discipline in the Church. They admitted the principle, at least, even if they had now neglected their duty. For all its faults, it seems that the Corinthian church exercised discipline better than many professing churches today.

Note that the command "Excommunicate the evil man from among you," with the exception of the imperative verb instead of the future, is a verbatim quotation from Deuteronomy 24:7 (LXX). Here again the Old Testament applies to New Testament Christians.

Summary: Christians should not bring civil suits against other Christians before a pagan judge. Since the saints will judge angels, they are competent to decide such cases as these. The mention of theft and embezzlement leads Paul to warn the Corinthians against a variety of sins.

1 "Does any one of you who has a case against another dare to be judged before the unjust and not before saints?"

The verb "Does anyone dare" seems to suggest that the Corinthians already were at least dimly aware that they should not take other Christians to court. Roman law permitted the Jews to settle questions of property among themselves; but it is doubtful that this fact was the basis of Corinthian opinion. Certainly it was not the basis of Paul's argument. Paul begins by contrasting the unrighteous heathen with the saints and continues by stressing the prerogatives of the latter.

2 "Or don't you know that the saints will judge the world?" This idea is also found in Daniel 7:22, Matthew 19:28, Luke 22:30, and Revelation 2:26-27.

2b "And if the world is judged by you [in the future], are you incompetent in trivial matters [in the present]?" *Kritērion* usually means "tribunals," but verse 4 seems to require "matters" of judgment.

Paul's argument here may puzzle us, especially if the words inserted in the square brackets be stressed. If we shall in the future be competent to judge the world, does it logically follow that we are now competent to judge anything? Justices Marshall and Taney were competent to judge many complex matters; but when they were infants two years old, they were not competent to judge anything. The difficulty is all the more glaring because Paul had already described the

Corinthians as infants. Commentators usually dodge this difficulty.

The solution is probably or possibly as follows: To continue the illustration of Chief Justice Taney, one may ask, if at age fifty, he was competent to sit on the Supreme Court, at the age of twenty-five was he not competent to be a justice of the peace? Note that verse 2 is a question. Paul does not say that future ability logically implies a present ability half way up the scale, but rather that future ability is ordinarily anticipated with lesser competence at an earlier age. After all, the Corinthians may have acted childishly, may have and did condone sin, and were spiritual infants, but as business men, they had a sufficient grasp of property rights to judge in such cases. Would the Corinthians have answered "No" to Paul's question?

3 "Don't you know that we shall judge angels, not to mention matters in this life?" *Mētige* (not to mention) is a hapax legomenon, in other words, the word occurs only here in the New Testament.

Although there are several verses referring to the saints' judging the world, there is no other to the saints' judging angels. Hebrews 1:14, "Art they not all ministering spirits, sent out as servants, for the sake of those who will inherit salvation?" may suggest that men who inherit salvation are proper judges of their servants; but how they are to judge, whether they are to judge both good and bad angels, or only one group or the other, and when this judgment shall take place with what results, are questions unanswerable at present.

4 "If you have [civil] cases concerning this life, do you seat [as judges] those who are despised by the church?"

Again *kritērion* can mean either a court or a case. Since the Corinthian church did not have courts, but used pagan courts, the word here must mean cases. Some of the confusion is due to the fact that the same preposition in Greek means both *in* and *by*. If the verse is translated, "Do you seat

those in the church who are despised?" the implication would be that there were church courts for civil cases, but there were not. Paul is arguing that there should be. Hence, the other translation makes much better sense: (to paraphrase) If you have civil cases, as you too often do, do you accept the despised pagans as judges? Which, of course, they had been doing. Otherwise, it would be necessary to suppose, not only that the Corinthian church had courts for civil cases, but that they were so stupid as to select as judges the most despised members in the church. Surely, this is an impossible interpretation.

5-6 "I say this to shame you. Is it so, that there is among you no wise man who can judge between [one man and] his brother? But one brother is judged by another brother and this before unbelievers."

Paul shames them by pointing out the contrast between their conceited claims to wisdom and the admission, implied by their practice of appealing to heathen judges, that there are no wise men among them.

7-8 "It is already an absolute defeat for you that you have court cases with each other. Why not suffer injustice? Why not rather be defrauded? But you commit injustice and defraud, and this your brothers."

The idea of this passage seems to be: it is a disgrace to sue a Christian in a secular court; it would be better to use a church court. However, it is already a step backwards in sanctification to sue at all. It would be better to let the thieving Christian keep his loot and so heap coals of fire upon his head (Rom. 12:20). Of course, this does not excuse the Christian thief: he commits sin in defrauding anyone.

However, this is not the whole story. One might at first think that this passage rules out all civil courts as well. This is not so. Our Lord, Himself, gave provisions for ecclesiastical courts. Whether he was thinking of property rights or only of personal grievances, Matthew 18:15-18 does not make clear. It does make clear, however, that if the accused refuses to

accept the decision of the ecclesiastical court, he is to be considered a publican and may be brought before a civil or criminal court. Paul, himself, appealed to the Roman courts, and insisted on his rights as a citizen, against the charges of the Pharisees and Sadducees.

9-11 "Or don't you know that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived. Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor swindlers, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such were some of you. But you were washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God."

Neither the translation nor the interpretation of the first two of these verses causes any difficulty. A reference back to 5:9, however, may be made, in that the words *malakoi* and *arsenokōitai* are much more pointed words for homosexuality than the word *pornos* of the earlier passage. If the apostate denominations want congregations of homosexuals, why do they not also establish congregations of practicing prostitutes and the murderous Mafiosi?

At these verses, the liberal commentator, E. M. Robertson, says that "There are no binding rules for a Christian. He cannot say that such and such behavior is forbidden" (p. 50). Surely no intelligent student can get this situation ethics out of Paul. Homosexuality is most definitely forbidden, both here and in Romans 1:27. There is also the Old Testament, to which Paul appeals as much as he does to his own apostolic authority. What does this commentator think the Ten Commandments were for? What reason can he give why Paul wrote chapter five? It is incredible how ridiculous liberals can be.

The eleventh verse contains a small difficulty. There are three verbs: *washed*, *sanctified*, and *justified*. Many commentators take these verbs as distinct ideas: *washed* means baptism, and the other two refer to two distinct steps in an

individual's salvation. Yet, if so, it is strange that justification follows sanctification. One commentator wants to understand *were justified as were made righteous*. Not only is this at variance with the regular usage of *dikaioō*, but if so taken it is no longer distinct from sanctification. Calvin apparently understands the three verbs as expressing one comprehensive idea. This seems best. Further, *washed* hardly means baptism, but rather *washed in the blood of the Lamb*. *Were sanctified* (aorist tense) cannot mean subjective and perfect moral achievement, for that was still future to those Corinthians, but rather means *set apart as holy*. Justification can mean what it means in Romans and Galatians, without considering it to be mentioned in reverse order.

12-13 "All things are permissible for me, but not all are advantageous. All things are permissible for me, but I will not be overpowered by any. Foods for the stomach and the stomach for foods; but God will abolish both it and them. The body is not for fornication, but for the Lord and the Lord for the body."

There is a connection between 6:9-11 and 6:12 ff., but there is a slight break that might suggest a new paragraph. The connection is that in both parts, Paul is discussing various sins. However, whereas 6:9-11 is direct condemnation of sin, 6:12 ff. gives reasons for avoiding these sins and exhortations to do so.

The earlier part put considerable emphasis on sexual sins, mentioning them four times to one mention each of six other sins. The present part begins with food and leads into further references to fornication. The connection of food with fornication, which may at first seem a strange combination, lies in the fact that both are bodily activities. Therefore, with these suitable examples, Paul will discuss the Christian use of the body.

When Paul begins by saying that all things are permitted, someone might think that fornication is also permitted, even though it might not be advantageous. Of course, the whole

Bible shows that this is ridiculous. Yet a group calling itself Campus Christians, and operating in some universities, has said that Christ broke all the Ten Commandments so that we would not have to keep them. Similarly, the Association for the Advancement of Christian Studies, centered in Toronto, relieve us of obeying the Commandments on the ground that they were historically conditioned and do not apply to the twentieth century (as if marriage and private property existed only in the time of Moses). Such examples are conclusive evidence that I Corinthians must be applied today.

When Paul therefore says all things are permitted, he means all types of action. Fornication is forbidden, but sexual intercourse is not forbidden. Sexual intercourse is permitted by law and its legitimacy is asserted later in 7:1-7.

The use of the word *all* in the New Testament has confused those who do not stop to ask, all of what? This is how some people try to refute the limited atonement and misunderstand the plain meaning of II Peter 3:9. In Luke, Augustus taxes all the world, but he did not tax the Incas in Peru. I Timothy 2:4 says God desires all men to be saved, but the opening verses show that Paul is referring to all classes of men. Thus in the present case, Paul asserts that all types of bodily motion are permissible, such as walking down the street or bending the index finger. However, contracting the index finger on the trigger of a loaded pistol pointed at your mother-in-law is not permissible.

Some commentators take *panta* to mean all adiaphora, all indifferent actions, actions that are neither commanded nor forbidden. This suggestion fits in well with such things as meats, but is ruled out by the context on fornication, for sexual intercourse with harlots is forbidden and with one's wife is commanded.

Though all types of action are permitted, Paul will not be overpowered or ruled by anything. The verb is also found in Luke 22:25, where those who *exercise authority* are called benefactors; it is found twice in 7:14, and nowhere else. The

meaning is clear: Paul will go to the Olympic games, if he wishes, but he will not become such a sports fan that he forgets everything else. Or, he will enjoy a thick beefsteak, if he can afford it, for the stomach's function is to receive food. Yet, in the regeneration (Matt. 19:28), God will abolish the stomach and its food—both will be destroyed.

Most Greeks and some Christians applied the same principle to sex and condoned fornication. Well, truly, sex is a bodily function, but the body is for the Lord and fornication is forbidden.

14-15 "Now God has raised the Lord and will raise us by his power. Do you not know that your bodies are parts of Christ? Shall I then take away parts of Christ and make them parts of a prostitute? Let that never be!"

The reference to the resurrection is here appended to the ideas that God will destroy both stomach and food, and that the body belongs to the Lord. Just what the body will be after the resurrection, when both food and sex are abolished, is a matter more fully discussed later. Obviously, we shall be more intellectual and less emotional and corporeal than we are now. At this point, however, the main idea concerns fornication.

Probably the verse should not be taken as an argument against fornication, in the sense that it proves fornication to be wrong. If it were so taken, it would be: the Christian is part of Christ, and since a prostitute cannot be a Christian . . . but what is the conclusion? Surely one cannot validly conclude that a Christian cannot commit fornication. If one identifies the conclusion as: a Christian *ought* not to commit fornication, the argument would be invalid because the conclusion contains a term, *ought*, that is not in the premises. Therefore, it is best not to take the verse as a *proof* that fornication is wrong. Its evil character is accepted from the Ten Commandments, and this verse and the next point out conclusions of this accepted fact.

16-17 "Do you not know that he who is joined to a

harlot is one body [with her]? For it says, 'The two become one flesh.' But he who is joined to the Lord is one spirit [with him]."

Again, these verses are exhortation, or at most a statement about one phase of sexual relationship, rather than a proof that fornication is wrong. Note that it is not wrong for a man, though a part of Christ, to become one flesh with a woman. The Old Testament quotation refers to legal and holy marriage. However, on the previous scriptural commands, it is wrong for a Christian to become one flesh with a harlot. The Corinthians had probably not connected this part of Old Testament teaching on marriage with the common practices around them. Therefore, this particular idea is appropriate for an exhortation.

18: "Flee fornication. Every sin that a man does is outside the body, but the fornicator sins against his own body."

A few verses above, the biblical use of the word *all* was noted. Here too *all*, in the singular (every, *pan*), is a general statement limited by an exception. In this case, the exception immediately follows. In other cases, the limitation may not be so obvious. Yet just because biblical usage states a general truth first and adds a limitation later, we, who are accustomed to the English usage that avoids generalizations—rules that hold only for the most part—by including the exception in the statement itself, should not accuse the Bible of not stating the truth.

Another question arises. Granted that fornication is not "outside the body" and that it is a sin "against his own body," is it the only such sin? Is it the only exception to the general rule? What about drunkenness, known to Paul of course, and heroin addiction, fortunately unknown to Paul? Are these not sins against the body? The explanation is that while drunkenness and drug addiction are sins against the body, they are the result of a man's using external objects to harm his body. In fornication, the man uses his body itself. The harm, the sin against his body, is not quite as physical as

in the other cases. Aside from venereal disease, fornication has no particular bodily effects. The effects are psychological, spiritual, and theological. The sin unites in one body the two persons involved, and this union is incompatible both with the union of a lawful marriage and with union with Christ in one spiritual or "mystical" body. The following verses support this explanation:

19-20 "Don't you know that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit in you, and that you are not your own? For you have been bought with a price. Then glorify God in your body."

The NAS chooses the poorer translation here as it did in 3:16. Definite predicate nominatives that precede the verb do not take the article. Therefore, "your body is *the* [not *a*] temple of God." Fornication then is a desecration of God's temple. The Spirit dwells in this temple because it is His. This temple, that is, we Christians, have been bought with a price, the precious blood of Christ. What other conclusion can there be except that we should glorify God in our bodies?

7

1-16 Summary: There are advantages in being unmarried, but it is better to marry than to sin. Marriage, however, imposes several obligations. Sexual relations are one; preserving the marriage is another. When one party is a Christian and the other is not, the Christian should not desert the pagan. Continuing the relationship may lead to the conversion of the unbeliever.

1 "Concerning the things you wrote about, it is good for a man not to be bound to a woman."

KJ and NAS translate it, "it is good for a man not to touch a woman," with the implication that sexual intercourse is the main idea. Now, it is true that *haptō* or *haptomai* can mean sexual intercourse, but the basic meaning is to fasten or bind. The lexicon gives: grasp, engage in, touch, set to work, perceive (grasp with the senses), set on fire. The basic meaning is best. Paul is no longer condemning fornication; he is discussing marriage. Furthermore, the letter that the Corinthians had written to Paul probably did not mention fornication, for they did not take it seriously enough. Rather, they seemed to be concerned with a "present distress," mentioned below in 7:26. The advice of this chapter, aside from universal divine law, does not apply without exception: it is restricted to similar situations. This is important to note as the comparison of marriage with celibacy continues. The verse says it is good not to marry.

Paul is not condemning marriage. (1) It is unlikely that any Jew who accepted the Old Testament would do so. (2) The next verse approves of marriage. (3) 1 Timothy 4:3 condemns those who forbid marriage. (4) Hebrews 13:4 says that marriage is honorable. (5) Genesis 2:18 shows that it is a divine institution. (6) 1 Timothy 3:2 may merely require a

bishop to avoid polygamy, and this can be done by never marrying at all; but it can also be taken to mean that a bishop must be a married man, for the fifth verse says, if he cannot rule his own house, how can he take care of the church of God? In any case, marriage is approved, but in the situation at Corinth, it was expedient not to be married.

2 "But because of fornication let each man have his own wife, and let each woman have her own husband."

This may not be the most excellent reason for marrying, but in Corinthian societies, where *Playboy* and *Playgirl* dominate so many minds, it is a sufficient reason.

3-6 "Let the man discharge his obligation toward his wife, and similarly the wife to her husband. The wife does not have authority over her own body, but the husband. Similarly the man also does not have authority over his own body, but the wife. Do not deprive each other, except by agreement, temporarily, in order to have leisure for prayer, and then come together again in order that Satan may not tempt you through your lack of self-control. This I say by way of indulgence, not as a command."

The letter the Corinthians had written to Paul must have concerned a tendency to asceticism rather than a concern about fornication. Asceticism is an expected minority reaction in situations of general licentiousness. This reaction also developed later in Romanism and gave rise to nunneries and celibate priests. Paul denounces these ideas. Conjugal duties are to be discharged. The two are one flesh.

In view of contemporary demands for abortion it is interesting to note that the New Testament disallows one of the women libbers'¹ frequent arguments: Should not a woman have control over her own body? The answer is, No. So far as

1. Two or three centuries from now, if someone should come upon this volume as an antique, he may be puzzled by the contemporary phrase "women libbers." Libbers are people who want to be liberated. Women's Lib, at the present time, is a movement whose members demand the civil right to promiscuity with the subsequent murder of the child conceived.

married persons are concerned, Paul points out some mutual responsibilities. One of the purposes of marriage is to beget and rear children. A wife has no right to deny her husband this fulfillment of the marriage obligation. As for contemporary unmarried abortionists, it is clear that these women had previously decided what to do with their bodies. That is how they got pregnant. They should now be held responsible and prevented from committing murder.

With reference to sexual relations in marriage, Paul does not merely permit such, he insists that neither husband nor wife should defraud the other. They may refrain temporarily by mutual consent for special periods of prayer, but they must return *epi to auto*, to the same thing. Such temporary abstinence is also found in the Old Testament ritual. That this ritual symbolism should be continued in the New Testament may seem strange, for the time involved would not much increase the amount of leisure, but at any rate, the abstinence must be only temporary, for otherwise Satan will tempt one party or the other to adultery.

The final phrase, "This I say by way of indulgence and not as a command," raises the question of what is meant by indulgence. The demonstrative *this* cannot refer to anything following because 7:7 is a sort of conclusion and 7:8 begins a new paragraph. Therefore, *this* must refer to something previous.

There are three possible references. (1) Your coming together again is by indulgence. This interpretation is impossible because coming together again is a command. (2) Verse 1, "Let each man have his own wife" may be by way of indulgence. Of course, verse 3 cannot be the reference because if a man is married, he is commanded not to neglect his wife. In favor of verse 2, is the consideration that marriage is not absolutely commanded for everybody. Against this reference is the fact that verse 6 is rather far removed from verse 2. (3) The third possibility is that temporary abstinence is permitted, not commanded. This makes good sense, and its

position is nearer than verse 2 to the demonstrative *this*. Furthermore, this interpretation removes the strangeness of finding a bit of Old Testament ritual in the New Testament. Paul did not forbid certain Old Testament procedures. For Jews, he still allowed circumcision; and he did not require them to eat pork. He forbade them to force others to abstain from pork. This interpretation, that temporary abstinence is by indulgence and not by command, is a little awkward, however, because the phrase is only a dependent clause, subordinate to the main idea of verse 5. The reader may judge for himself; but it seems that the awkwardness in 7:5 is less of a difficulty than the distance back to verse 2.

7 "I wish that all men were as I am. But each has his own gift from God, one man this, another that."

The first phrase leads some commentators to conclude that Paul had never married. One argument is that it is impossible to place Paul's marriage after the stoning of Stephen. However, there is no reason at all for such an assertion. Furthermore, it is not impossible that, although young, Paul may have married before the stoning of Stephen. If "consenting" in Acts 22:20 means that he had voted for Stephen's death in the Sanhedrin, he must have been married, for all the members of the Sanhedrin had to be. The other and more likely interpretation of the present verse is that Paul was a widower.

8-9 "I say to the unmarried and the widows, it is good for them if they remain as I am. But if they cannot control themselves, let them marry, for it is better to marry than to burn [with passion]."

Some commentators use this verse also to suggest that Paul had never married. Meyer insists that *agamoi* (unmarried) is both masculine and feminine and that *kai tais kerais* should be translated "and especially the widows"; from which he concludes that Paul had never married. This is obviously bad logic. Aside from the logic, the grammar is not the best. True enough, *agamoi* can refer both to men and

women; but *kai* in this phrase is very awkward as *especially*; it is simple *and*. Hence the better grammar is "unmarried men and widows." The word *unmarried* may indeed include others than widowers. In the Corinthian situation, it surely includes unmarried young men. Yet to speak to all unmarried men, young men and widowers, and to widows (unmarried girls are considered later) in the same sentence shows nothing of the status of the speaker.

If these two verses stated a universal principle, they would deprecate marriage and make celibacy spiritually superior. However, two reasons oppose this interpretation. First, on this interpretation, verse 9 would not merely denigrate marriage, it would reduce marriage to the brute level of copulation and nothing more, but such is not the biblical view. Not to mention the many passages in the Old Testament, Paul, himself, in Ephesians 5:22-23 says, "The husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the Church." Then, second, as we have seen, widows, if not widowers, are the subject of the argument, rather than unmarried girls, whose situation is taken up in verses 28 and 36.

The actual complications in Corinth should be kept in mind. First, there was some asceticism (probably); because of which Paul advises marriage in ordinary cases. Second, there was a great amount of lasciviousness, because of which Paul had inveighed against fornication and here says it is better to marry than to burn with passion, and, third, there is some "present distress," presumably imminent persecution, during which it would be better not to be married. This last unusual circumstance accounts for much of Paul's puzzling language in this chapter. Even so, in spite of the added dangers and cruel heartbreaks attendant on persecution, it is better to marry than to commit fornication, for marriage and tragedy are not sin, but fornication is.

10-11 "Now to the married I command, not I, but the Lord, that the wife should not desert her husband—but if she separates, let her remain unmarried or be reconciled to her

husband--and that the husband should not dismiss his wife."

After recommending people to remain unmarried because of the present stringency, it is natural to say something about those who are already married. Therefore, Paul gives a divine command. He contrasts this command with his personal advice. Two problems arise: (1) Does Paul here admit that he is not inspired, as the liberals would have it; and (2) When and how did the Lord issue this command?"

The second point is of lesser importance and can be disposed of first. Where did Paul learn of the command? There are four possibilities. (1) If any of the Gospels had been written by this time--and the dates assigned to the Gospels are earlier now than they were in the first quarter of this century--Paul could have read the explicit command. This is not a good explanation, for strictly speaking there is no *explicit* command on the present situation. (2) Again, if any of the Gospels had been written, Paul may have deduced this command from Christ's general teaching on marriage. Also, it would not require Paul's exceptional intellectual attainments to draw this conclusion. (3) If anyone dislikes logic, or with a greater show of logic, if anyone dates the Gospels later, one may say with Meyer that "Paul knew from the living voice of tradition what commands Christ had given concerning divorce." First, this is not a case of divorce. Second, why should one appeal to tradition? Tradition is not only fallible, but for Paul it was superfluous. (4) Direct revelation is the fourth possibility. Paul was an apostle, on a par with Old Testament prophets; God spoke to him directly. If the word *Lord* does not refer to Christ during His earthly life, the Old Testament would be a fifth possibility, but probably the second of these five is the best guess.

Now, as to the first and more important question; namely, does the contrast between concession and command imply that Paul was not divinely inspired at this point? The same applies to verse 6 above and verses 12 and 40 below.

The conclusion that Paul was only partially inspired, and perhaps that we cannot tell just when he was and when he was not, is an unnecessary conclusion. The doctrine of inerrancy guarantees the truth of all Scripture. Paul said that he offered some advice that was less than a divine command. His statement is inspired and true. There is no diminution of or limitation to inspiration. The remarks are inspired advice. Yet they are only advice because it is no sin to do otherwise. The present verse, a divine command, is no more inspired than the previous advice; but it is not advice. It is an inspired command; the wife is obligated to remain with her husband. The situation has nothing to do with adultery, in which case the innocent party may divorce the offender. The present dangerous situation cannot be used as a ground for divorce or even for a separation.

However, all wives do not obey this command. Such deserters are then under obligation to remain unmarried; and in case the husband initiates the separation, he is to remain unmarried. Hopefully, in either case, they may come together again. The word is, *be reconciled*. Does this signify that the separation occurred because of some domestic annoyance rather than because of persecution? It is almost certain that this is not envisaged in the text. Reconciliation is needed because the separation itself is an affront to the other party. Then let the one be reconciled to the other.

12-13 "To the rest I say, not the Lord, if any brother have an unbelieving wife, and she be pleased to live with him, let him not send her away [divorce her]. And if any wife have an unbelieving husband, and he is pleased to live with her, let her not send her husband away."

In the preceding verses, because the Corinthian letter as a whole is addressed to the church, Paul has in mind a marriage in which both parties are Christian. Obviously, in a pagan country where the Gospel has only recently been preached, one member of an established marriage may be converted, and not the other. These and the following verses concern mixed marriages.

The distinction between a mixed marriage and a marriage of two believers does not exhaust the complexities of the problem. Four situations must be kept in mind, and only by doing so can one harmonize the various scriptural commands. What applies to one type of marriage does not necessarily apply to another. We must see to which situation a given command was addressed. The four types are these: (1) two believers are husband and wife; (2) a believer and an unbeliever are married; (3) two unbelievers get married and they remain unbelievers; (4) two unbelievers are married and later one becomes a Christian. Now, if Jesus gives a command for the first case, and Paul gives a command for the fourth case, no inconsistency arises even if one command does not apply to the other case.

However, prior to a consideration of one of these cases, the present verse, somewhat related to verses 6 and 10, distinguishes between what Paul says and what the Lord said. However, the previous comments did not cover all possibilities. Those comments had to do with the contrast between advice and command. Here, there is a distinction between the Lord and Paul, but nonetheless what Paul says is a command. It would indeed be strange if the verse were interpreted to mean: the believing husband is conceded the right to keep his wife, though he may divorce her if he wishes. On the contrary, there is here a command not to send the unbeliever away.

Then why is there a distinction between the Lord and Paul? It must be because Jesus during his earthly ministry gave no command relative to mixed marriages. The people to whom he preached were all Jews and were officially included in the covenant. Paul faced an entirely different state of affairs.

Since the phrases, "Not I, but the Lord," and, "I say, not the Lord," seem to refer to the words of Jesus in the flesh, verse 12 is a help in selecting the best of four possibilities in the earlier comment. Either Paul had read one or two Gos-

pels, or had talked with Peter and the other apostles—and, of course, he had—and thereby knew what Jesus had said. If one insist that Jesus had not considered mixed marriages, then, although deductions could be logically carried through with reference to marriages within the covenant, the only deductions possible relative to mixed marriages would be the universal obligations in marriage and the universal grounds for divorce. Even this is not clear, for Ezra commanded the Jews to divorce their foreign wives. Hence, while Paul might have deduced the previous command of the Lord from a reading of a Gospel, here it seems best to conclude that Paul had received a direct revelation and that this command was promulgated by the prophetic authority of an apostle.

14 "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife by the husband; since otherwise your children are unclean, but now they are holy."

This verse is stated as a reason why the believer should remain with the unbelieving spouse. No reason needed to be given. Moral laws are what they are by divine authority and decree. However, while they are enacted by the sovereign decision of God, God has purposes for the details of His administration. God even has a purpose for this tree's growing in one location rather than another. God's purposes, however, cannot be discovered by observation. Hence the science of physics cannot explain nature by teleological concepts. Only by revelation can man learn what God's purposes are. Even when an event is in the past, like Napoleon's invasion of Russia, or World War I, and we know that God purposed to cause that event, we still do not know the further purposes of the event. This verse states a purpose. Yet again, though God has revealed this purpose, the Christian may not assume that this purpose is the only purpose of the command. God reveals some of His purposes, but not all.

Now, what is the purpose? There are four or five possibilities. So far as the first half of the verse goes, a superficial reader might easily assume that (1) the believer would ex-

plain the plan of salvation, live a Christian life, and that thus, the unbeliever would eventually be converted. However, (2) a more careful or literal interpretation could be that the unbeliever is automatically made a saint by means of the other's conversion, but when the children are mentioned in the last half of the verse, the first and second interpretations, whichever one a student prefers, are seen to be incomplete. Three more possibilities must be examined: (3) only a Christian marriage is a true or legal marriage—civil ceremonies are all illegitimate; (4) infants then were not and should not ever be baptized; and (5) infants with at least one believing parent were then and should now be baptized.

Which one or which combination of these five should be accepted? Since most of the readers of this commentary will presumably prefer the first interpretation, something should be said to show that the second is not immediately ridiculous. The Old Testament depicts salvation as running in families. The descendants of Abraham were chosen in Abraham. Deuteronomy 4:37 says, "Because he loved your fathers, therefore he chose their descendants after them." Again, one may argue from God's mercy: if God saves all who die in infancy, even those of the heathen, as many Christians believe, then why may he not show mercy on the unbelieving spouse for the sake of the believer? This interpretation is therefore not utterly ridiculous.

Nevertheless, the Old Testament makes it fairly clear that not all the descendants of Abraham were saved. Probably Ishmael and certainly Esau were lost. In addition, the New Testament is pointedly individualistic: "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish"; and John 8:24, "If ye believe not . . . ye shall die in your sins" (cf. Mark 16:16, John 3:18, et al.). This invalidates the second interpretation and allows the first to stand, unless another possibility is found.

Yet, let us not too hastily accept the first. Notice carefully that the verse does *not* say that the believer *may possibly later on* sanctify the unbeliever. The verse says, that the

believer immediately and automatically sanctifies the unbeliever at the moment the former is converted. It looks then as if both the first and second interpretations are wrong. Can the remainder of the verse give us more light?

The next three interpretations look at the verse from a different angle. They may bear on the first two possibilities, but they are directly concerned with marriage and children. So, (3) Protestants are not legally married, because only a Christian marriage is valid. A Christian marriage occurs only when at least one party is a Christian and the ceremony is performed by the Roman Catholic Church (cf. Papal Syllabus of Errors, 71, 73). The children must be raised as Romanists. If two Protestants marry, their children are illegitimate and cannot inherit their parents' property.

Insofar as the Reformers identified the Papacy with the antichrist, this part of the papal system falls with the whole. However, to restrict the discussion to the one question of marriage, one may note that neither the Old Testament nor the New Testament considers the children of pagans as illegitimate. Marriage is designed for the whole human race. Even to Ishmael, who mocked Sarah and Isaac, God gave a blessing, in particular many children and descendants. These descendants are rather clearly legitimate, for otherwise God would not have called them a blessing. So, too, is the Papal theory of civil government and the Reformers' view. The Reformers did not allow rebellion against the lawful monarchy merely on account of his religion (cf. Westminster Confession, XXII, 4 and XXIII, 4), whereas the Pope called upon the English Catholics to do away with Queen Elizabeth.

Furthermore, to return to marriage, the marriages Paul is considering in this chapter were not "Christian" marriages. They were pagan ceremonies. Now, where both parties later became Christian, Paul would have, on this interpretation, demanded them to be married over again in a Christian ceremony. He did not. Even in the case of two young Christians, never before married, Paul did not demand an ecclesiastical

ceremony, though he insisted that a Christian should marry only a Christian. In the Old Testament with its theocratic state, the law did not require a religious consecration of the matrimonial tie, and the New Testament does not add to the Old Testament requirements.

Here, one may mention a minor peculiarity in Romanism. Marriage is a sacrament, they say; but celibacy is not. Ordination may be, but a young man who refuses to marry is not celebrating a sacrament. Yet celibacy is superior to married life. Hence, in this case, it is spiritually advantageous to avoid the sacrament: the sacrament causes spiritual damage.

The next two interpretations bring the status of children under consideration. One view denies infant baptism, the other establishes it. The phrase in question is, "since otherwise your children are unclean, but now they are holy." If the Romish theory of marriage is false, then the words *unclean* and *holy* cannot mean illegitimate and legitimate. What then do they mean?

To answer this the logical anatomy of the argument must be laid bare. The conclusion is, do not separate. The premises must answer the question, why? Do not separate *because* the believer sanctifies the unbeliever. Why is this true? This is true *because* otherwise the children would be unclean, but they are in fact holy.

Thus the analysis of the argument shows that the conclusion, "Do not separate," depends on the conceded premise that the child of a believer, even if born before conversion, is holy. This is what is conceded, taken for granted, and obvious (at least to Paul and to the Corinthians). No farther argument or reason is given why the children are holy.

However, what was so obvious to the Corinthians is not so obvious to twentieth century Christians. Let us moderns, therefore try to guess why the children are holy. One guess is that the children are holy *because* the church, the Corinthian church, baptized them. This would explain why Paul's statement was obvious to the Corinthians. Against this guess

Meyer argues, "Had baptism of children been then in existence, Paul could not have drawn this inference because in that case the *hagiotēs* of children would have had another basis." Meyer seems to mean that if children were baptized, and the children were holy because the Corinthians baptized them, it would be their baptism and not their parent's conversion that would have made them saints. Since now the text says the parent sanctifies the child, children could not have been baptized.

This argument is doubly fallacious. At best, it could only conclude that baptism does not make a child holy. It could not conclude that infant baptism did not exist. The argument also is based on a misunderstanding. When one says, the children are holy because the Corinthian church baptized them, one does not necessarily mean that it was the baptism that sanctified them. It could and more likely would mean that only holy children are baptized, and since the Corinthians baptized them, it is clear that they were already holy. That is to say, baptism makes no one holy; but it is a sign that the person, child or adult, is already holy. Therefore, the Corinthian church, with this knowledge, baptized these infants, and thus everyone knew they were holy. This explains the force of *epei ara*: "otherwise then." The known fact, conceded by all, properly stands as the principal premise of the argument.

This also answers the question in what sense the believing wife sanctifies the unbelieving husband and vice versa. It does not mean that the believer automatically makes the unbeliever a Christian, though his conversion may take place later. To answer how the believer sanctifies the unbeliever, one must understand the meaning of the verb *sanctify*. To sanctify is to consecrate or dedicate to God. In the Old Testament *days* were sanctified, the *utensils* in the temple were sanctified; and so too the *priests*. Peter's vision on the housetop in Joppa showed that now all *foods* were sanctified or cleansed. See 1 Timothy 4:5, where the verb is *hagiazetai*.

Likewise, Romans 11:16 says, "if the root is holy, so are the branches." This implies that if the parents are holy, the children are too. As the temple sanctified the *gold* that decorated it, so the believing parent sanctifies both the other spouse and the children.

This is consistent with the rite of circumcision. In the Old Testament, the children, not Abraham alone, were included in the covenant, and the sign of the covenant was put upon the children, both Ishmael and Isaac. Baptism is the circumcision of Christ (Col. 2:11-12). Once again recall that the New Testament is based on the Old Testament and cannot be understood without it.

Thus the correct interpretation is that the conversion of one marriage partner automatically dedicates the whole household to God, and the implication follows that the children should be baptized.

15 "Yet if the unbeliever separates, let him separate. The brother or the sister is not bound under these circumstances. But God has called us in peace [to peace, or, by peace]."

This verse teaches that willful desertion is a legitimate ground for divorce in mixed marriages. Such is the historical position of the Reformation as against the Romish position that not even adultery justifies divorce. The addition of willful desertion as a ground for divorce does not contradict Christ's restriction of divorce to cases of adultery because Christ was not talking about mixed marriages. He was speaking within Judaism.

The great difficulty is to reconcile Paul with Ezra. The Old Testament prophet had ordered the Jews to divorce their foreign wives. This was not a provision of the Mosaic law. The only absolute prohibition of marriage with foreigners is that against Canaanitish women. Moses, himself, had married a foreigner. Deuteronomy 21:10-13 definitely approves of marrying captive girls taken in war, under a prescribed procedure. Ezra then went beyond the Mosaic law. Paul is not in

accord with Ezra because Ezra demanded that the believer divorce the unbeliever; Paul will continue the marriage if the unbeliever is content to remain with the believing spouse.

Paul says that if the unbeliever deserts, the believer is not bound. This means that divorce is allowable (as Romanists deny), but against lax positions allowable only on one or the other of two grounds. "In such cases the brother is not bound" by the marriage contract, and is therefore free to marry again.

The following phrase, "but God has called us to peace," is difficult to understand. The most literal translation is "in peace." The preposition is often translated *by*, but it seems unintelligible to say that God called us *by* peace. The best sense is, God has called us *to* peace; but this is the worst translation. It is just barely possible (cf. Luke 1:17, "to turn the disobedient *to* the prudence of the just").

The translation, however, does not determine the sense, for it can be taken two ways, whether in Greek or English. The first interpretation, which is superficially plausible, requires the believer to maintain the marriage if he can *because* there is a possibility that he may convert the unbeliever. However, this interpretation makes the reason in 7:16 refer to 7:12-13: in other words, the believer should not send away the unbeliever *because* he might possibly convert the other party. The immediate phrase to which 7:16 is attached is: the brother or sister is not bound by the marriage contract in these cases *because* God has called us to a peaceful life. The reason is a reason for not being bound, rather than a reason for not dismissing the unbeliever.

A slight objection to this view is that the conjunction is not *gar* (because), but *de* (but). As an adversative *but* could indicate the reverse of the situation just described. Yet this is only a slight objection because *de* is not a strong adversative like *alla*, and because it can introduce a reason for the preceding.

16 "For what do you know, wife, if you will save your

husband? Or what do you know, husband, if you will save your wife?"

Once again, the words will fit either of the two interpretations: the believer should hold on to the unbeliever, no matter how much the peace of the home is disturbed, *because* the one may possibly save the other. Contrariwise, do not force the unbeliever to remain *because* you do not know that you will save your spouse. If the verse had said, how do you know you will *not* save your husband?, the sense would be, keep trying, for you might. However, the absence of the negative adverb favors the second interpretation: how do you know you will?

The grammar, however, is not decisive. The point is whether 7:15 is two-thirds parenthetical, so that its final phrase refers to 7:12-13 seven lines above; or whether the final phrase refers to what immediately preceded it in the same verse.

As an appendage to this discussion, recognition should perhaps be given to an extreme interpretation from the opposite end of the spectrum. Henry Cowles denies that divorce is even permitted in these verses. He interprets, "not bound" as "not enslaved . . . in anxiety or agony of conscience, for God has called us to peace." His main reason against divorce is that 7:16 gives the believer hope that the departed spouse will be converted and then there could be and ought to be a reunion.

This idea does not quite fit the words, for the text says, not that the unbeliever may be converted by someone somewhere and then return, but, "if *thou* shalt save thy husband"; and this presupposes that the unbelieving husband has not (yet) deserted.

17-39 Summary: The Christian should pay little attention to the social order. Do not try to rise in rank or even to escape slavery. In the present stringency, it is better to remain unmarried. On the other hand, do not break up an established marriage. Be indifferent to both conditions. How-

ever, if a father is ashamed that his daughter is unmarried, he may marry her off. Death dissolves marriage, and the surviving party is free to marry again.

17 "Whether or not, as the Lord portioned out to each man, and as God has called each man, so let him conduct himself. And thus I order in all the churches."

Some of the difficulties of the previous verses continue here. Even to suggest that this is a new paragraph disconnects 7:17-24 from the preceding. That it really is a new paragraph, however, is scarcely to be doubted, for there is a change of subject, though it is connected with that which went before by way of generalization or extension.

Yet, there are at least three possible interpretations. The first translates "whether or not," or "however that may be," as *except*, and makes it read: What do you know about your unbelieving partner, *except* that you should use the gifts God gave you to convert him. This arrangement denies that there is a paragraph break, it attaches an exception to a clause that seems complete, and it does not make very good sense as an exception to anything.

The second interpretation connects the verse with "is not bound" in 7:15; in other words, the believer is not bound, *only* he is; not to use his freedom thoughtlessly—he is to remember that God has assigned him certain duties. The thought of this interpretation is in itself not bad; but there is no real connection with "is not bound."

The third interpretation relates to the fact that many pagans believed that Christianity aimed to destroy social institutions. One commentator alleges that the signs and wonders performed by the apostles gave rise to this idea. There is only a minimum of truth here. The miracles could have convinced the heathen that there was power in Christianity, but what really turned the world upside down was the message of the Gospel. It did indeed cause some social disturbances, in the sense that it disturbed the silversmith's business in images of Artemis. Reference to a kingdom to

come may have disturbed others. It could even be that some Christians found revolutionary activity an exciting temptation. Therefore, this verse warns the Christians that the Gospel is not a revolutionary, disorganizing conspiracy; and the following verses support this interpretation.

Such is the main idea. To return to the minor problem of the initial words: instead of making this an *exception* to what one may know about unbelieving partners, it is better to take it as referring to *whether or not* a marriage breaks up—in either case use the gifts God has given you.

It is also to be noted that this is a command addressed to all the churches. Some things in this chapter are addressed only to the Corinthians or to others in the same stringencies.

18-19 "Was anyone called after he had been circumcised? Let him not reverse it. Has anyone been called in uncircumcision? Let him not be circumcised. For circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing, but [what counts is] the observance of God's commandments."

The previous verse introduced the idea that Christianity does not aim at social revolution. Examples now follow. The first example and instruction is that a converted Jew is not to seek a surgical operation to remove the physical effect of circumcision. There was such an operation and Celsus describes it. 1 Maccabees 1:15 refers to it. If this occurred in the time of the Maccabees, it is possible that some Jewish converts to Christianity also sought this surgery. Paul condemns the idea.

There were also Jewish converts who argued that converted Gentiles should be circumcised. At the Jerusalem Council, in Galatians, and here, Paul condemns this idea also.

The reason given for both of these prohibitions is that circumcision is morally indifferent, as is also uncircumcision. The law of God neither requires nor prohibits every action or type of action. There is neither command nor prohibition relative to a young man's becoming a butcher or a stockbroker. The present chapter shows that neither marriage nor

single blessedness is necessary. Many actions and many types of actions are indifferent. Neither the performance nor their nonperformance is sin.

That circumcision is nothing must have seemed a distressing idea to the Jewish converts. Had not God commanded it? God had also commanded the food laws. However, as anticipations or types of Christ and His work, these were fulfilled and ended at His death. From then on, the Lord's Supper replaced the Passover and baptism replaced circumcision.

As there is a reason for reducing circumcision to the status of indifference, there is also reason for saying that that which counts is obedience to God's commands. If some Jews wanted to continue the Old Testament laws, in particular the ritual laws, others, mostly Gentile converts, went to the opposite extreme and claimed that grace had superseded law so that a Christian did not have to obey anything. This idea, technically called antinomianism, Paul refutes at length in Romans 6. Here, while the phrase denies antinomianism, the subject matter of the passage chiefly concerns a different point.

20 "Let each remain in the calling in which he was called."

Twice, this verse mentions a call, but the meaning is different. The verbal or second form refers to the irresistible divine call by which a sinner passes from death to life; but in addition, there is the indication that God also calls men to a certain social status. We speak of the practice of medicine as a physician's calling, though most people forget that it is God who places the man in that occupation. Since, however, it is God who issues the call, Paul directs the previously heathen, now Christian physician to remain a physician and not to change to something else. Paul's example in the next verse is far more striking than this one.

21 "Were you called [while] a slave? Let it not concern you. But even though you can become free, use it rather."

This is a verse that is almost universally misinterpreted

and mistranslated. KJ ignores the *kai* (even) in the last sentence. RSV's "avail yourself of the opportunity," and NAS's "rather do that," are downright mistranslations that no Greek scholar should allow. Similarly, Phillips and the NEB are also mistranslations. A dislike of Paul's doctrine does not justify altering it.

The correct interpretation and translation must take account of and give full force to the words *alla*, *kai*, and *mallon*. To say, "If you have the chance to become free, take it," is first of all to ignore the *kai*. This Greek word usually means *and*, where two things are connected, such as horse and buggy or ham and eggs; but it also means *even*, as in 2:11, "so even [or, also] the things of God," and 3:5, "even to each," and 5:7, "for even [or, also] the Passover," and 7:7, "as even myself"; and in fact there are nearly fifty instances in I Corinthians alone where *kai* means *also* or *even*. The force of the *kai* in the present verse emphasizes the fact that the example is an extreme one and that therefore the principle is universal.

This point is made all the stronger by the emphatic adverb *alla*. Thus the text begins with "But even though." Any other attempted translation weakens the force and leads to a misinterpretation.

Finally, there is the *mallon* (rather), in "Use it rather." What one uses and how, must be answered by the translation; but note the force of the *mallon*. If the verse meant, "if you have the chance to become free, take it," the word *rather* could not be fitted in. This word fits only if the meaning is, "If you can become free, don't; but rather use your status of slave for the Lord."

Not only is the grammar in conflict with the modern interpretation, the context is too. The previous verse said, let the uncircumcised man remain so, and let the circumcised remain so; let each man remain as he was. Then must not verse 21 mean, let the slave remain so? The following verse also makes sense only on this interpretation. Lastly, the case of Onesimus and Philemon support the same conclusion.

22 "For the slave who was called by the Lord is the Lord's freeman; similarly the freeman who was called is Christ's slave."

This verse is the reason or explanation of the previous verse. It would not be a reason, if the previous verse had advised the slave to gain his freedom. Some explanation is needed when the advice is to remain a slave, but otherwise no explanation is required. Hence, the interpretation above is correct.

23-24 "You were bought with a price. Do not become the slaves of men. Let each one, brethren, remain before God in the status in which he was called."

The first of these two verses is a further reason for being unconcerned with social distinctions. It is interesting to note the implication that a desire for liberation from slavery is, itself, a slavery to merely human distinctions. The second verse is a conclusion that repeats the principle of the section: remain in the status you occupied when God called you to spiritual freedom. This, again, fixes the meaning of 7:21.

25 "Concerning virgins. . . ." At first sight, this seems to introduce a new subject; but rather it is another example of the same subject. The marriage of young girls is another instance of social status. There is a difference, however. The former verses, 17-24, are a divine command to all churches. The present verses revert to and expressly state the limitation put on much of 7:1-16, to wit, the present stringency. There is also another difference. It is God's command either to be a slave or to escape from slavery.

25 "Concerning virgins I have no commandment from the Lord, yet I give my opinion as one who has been granted mercy by the Lord to be faithful."

Because *parthenos* is a feminine noun, one commentator declares that Paul's advice here is not addressed to young men. It would be strange, however, to advise girls not to marry but encourage boys to get married. Furthermore, *parthenos* (virgin) refers to young men in Revelation 14:4, and

in the next verse, *anthrōpō* surely refers to men as well as women.

Again, as in 7:10 and 12, Paul is giving inspired advice. It is not a denial of inspiration, as the liberals would have it; nor is it imposed as a command. It is not a command because the opposite is allowed; and the wording at least hints at inspiration because Paul had received mercy to be faithful.

26 "Accordingly I think that this is good because of the present necessity, that it is good for a man to be so."

"Accordingly" lightly refers to his having received mercy, and hence rather favors inspiration than denies it.

Since the necessity is "present" one supposes that some temporary situation is meant. After it is over, the advice will not apply. What this necessity or stringency was, can only be guessed; but persecution is a good guess.

"To be so" (*houtōs*) can only refer to virginity. There is nothing else in the context. The following verse both supports this verse and also the previous admonition against social revolution.

27-28 "Are you bound to a wife? Do not seek a release [divorce]. Are you free from a wife? Do not seek a wife. But even if you marry, you have not sinned. And even if a virgin marries, she has not sinned. But such people will have tribulation in the flesh, and I would spare you."

The main idea is that it is always bad to change one's social status: Christianity is not revolutionary activism. Marriage is hardly a case of changing one's social status; and at any rate, it is a divine command that provides for only a few exceptions. One of these exceptions is the present danger. On the other hand, the danger does not justify separation. Further, even if, against this advice—notice the two cases of *even if*, to which form of expression attention was called in 7:21—anyone marries, even if a young woman marries, he or she has not sinned.

The reason for not marrying is the impending persecution. The reason is not that celibacy is a superior virtue, as will be seen again in the next verse.

The tenses of the verbs need mention here. Hodge and Meyer both translate "if thou *shalt have* married, thou didst not sin." This rather suggests that if one marries now, he does sin, but such an inference is explicitly denied. The meaning is not, "if you are already married"; but rather, if you disregarded this advice and marry tomorrow, you will not sin. Paul is discussing whether getting married is advisable now. The only reference to a previous marriage is "do not seek a separation."

The verbs, however, are both aorists, and hence give the appearance of referring to the past, but an aorist subjunctive with *ean* (if), as well as the present subjunctive, makes a present general supposition. Therefore, the KJ and ARV are correct.

Another note on the Greek may be pardoned. Some verbs in Greek have two aorists, and to *marry* is one of them. In such cases, the first aorist is transitive and the second is intransitive. The present verse attaches the transitive form to the man who *marries* a girl; the intransitive form has "the virgin" as its subject: she *is married*.

The verse concludes with Paul's stating his desire to spare young people unnecessary trouble in times of persecution.

29 "This I say, brethren, the time is. . . ."

How one translates the next word depends on the interpretation. The usual meaning is "shortened"; or, briefly, one may say, the time is short. There is also a question as to how to translate *kairos* (time). On the basis of the usual or superficial translation, one wishes to know what time is short. There are three possibilities.

(1) The length of time between Paul's writing and the return of Christ is short. Liberal theologians often adopt this interpretation and identify the "present necessity" with the Parousia, in order to prove that Paul and the Bible are in error. The verse is used to show that Paul expected Christ's return in his own lifetime. Three reasons of unequal weight, yet each of some weight, oppose this view: (a) The "present

necessity" suggests a temporary period after which it will be again convenient to marry. (b) Paul knew that the Jews must be converted and that the antichrist had to come. He could not logically infer that this had to occur in his lifetime; as a persecution might. (c) There is nothing in the context that suggests the return of Christ. The subject is marriage, separation, and divorce, and fathers with marriageable daughters.

Then, too, in connection with the idea of a length of time between Paul's writing and the second advent, the word *kairos* does not mean a length of time, but rather a point or small period of time. The lexicon gives these meanings: due measure, fitness, point, importance, vital part of the body; and also critical time, season, opportunity, advantage, and profits. Hence, one must reject the interpretation that envisages a length of time to the Parousia.

(2) The next interpretation makes the verse and the word refer to our lifetime, but if the shortness of human life is the reason for Paul's advice, then it would always be bad to get married—from Abraham to the end of the world. One commentator who holds this view compounds his difficulties by attaching to this phrase the next words "from henceforth," and translates it as, "The time henceforth is short." However, the span of life did not just become short as Paul was writing. It had been short always, or at least since the antediluvians.

(3) A more plausible interpretation is that the time until the impending stringency breaks upon us is short, but this still fails to give the correct meaning to *kairos*.

The most reasonable view requires a second look at the word *short*. The verb from which *sunestalmenos* comes means: draw together, shorten sail, contract, deprive, humble; and its adverbial form means: with a short vowel; frugally, humbly.

When all this is put together, the translation becomes, "The opportunity is contracted," or "The critical time is restricted." The sense is: Don't make a change in your mari-

tal status, for there is little opportunity for advantage and much for disadvantage.

29 "... the opportunity is restricted. As for the rest, let also those who have wives be as if they did not have wives."

Instead of translating *to loipon* as *henceforth* and attaching it to the preceding words, it is better taken as "for the rest." The content has given advice against marriage; but naturally most people are already married, and there are a few general points to be made. Hence, "for the rest."

"For the rest, let also:" it is better to take *kai* as *also*, in relation to those who in the previous verses do not have wives. KJ and NAS connect this *kai* with the *kai* in 7:30, and read, *both* the married *and* those who weep. This is an awkward combination as contrasted with the unmarried and *also* the married. Further, the two *kai's* in 7:30, in fact the three of them, go well together, as will presently be seen.

There remains the word translated "Let." Actually, it is the usual word for a purpose clause. Meyer therefore translates it, "the time is shortened in order that those who have wives should be as if they did not." This is nonsense, and especially so with Meyer's position that it is a short time to the Parousia. Can anyone imagine that God shortened the time to the second advent in order that husbands should act as if they were not married?

Better is it to take the clause as a result clause; the time is shortened with the result that husbands should act as if unmarried.

Yet this reading of NAS suffers from taking *kairos* as a length that has been shortened. If it is not, there is a full stop after "shortened," and the phrase attaches to the preceding. After this break, *to loipon*, for the rest, introduces a new idea. This requires the conjunction *hina*, ordinarily a subordinate purpose clause, to introduce a hortatory subjunctive. This usage, which could hardly occur in classical Greek, is one of the extensions of meaning found occasionally in Koine. Arndt and Gingrich describe it as a substitute for the imperative.

30-31 "Both those who mourn as not mourning and those who rejoice as not rejoicing, as well as those who buy as not possessing, and those who use the world as not fully using it; for the form of this world is passing away."

Thus Paul urges the Corinthians, and perhaps us also in a modified sense, to avoid involvement in the world. We are to remain unaffected by the circumstances that cause most people to be sad or happy. No doubt we must buy, if only our food to keep alive; and if we are married and have children, it is our duty to support them. However, we must remain intellectually detached.

The only difficulty is the final phrase: the *schēma* of things is passing away. This is stated as a reason for not mourning, not rejoicing, and not possessing. Why is it a reason? Also, what is meant by the *schēma* of this world passing away?

"To pass away" is a strange meaning for a transitive verb in the active voice. 1 John 2:17 has it in the passive: "The world is passing away" (cf. 1 John 2:8). However, no other translation is possible.

Note, too, the present tense: it does not say that the world will pass away, but that it is now passing away. There are three possibilities: (1) the immediate danger is passing away; (2) everything is always passing away in a universal flux; and (3) the Parousia will come and alter the present scheme of things.

(1) The difficulty with saying that the immediate danger is passing away is (a) it is not passing away—it is just coming; and (b) the phrase "the present *kosmos*" can hardly mean the present stringency.

(2) The idea of universal flux—generation after generation, spring, summer, autumn, and winter, the rise and fall of empires, war after war—is equally unsatisfactory because (a) the idea is nowhere in the context and is foreign to the subject matter; and besides (b) it is a bad reason for the preceding exhortation, for it would imply that marriage is

undesirable in any age and situation. One commentator tries to combine the two and faces a double trouble.

This seems to leave the third interpretation as the only possible one—unless a fourth can be found. The third is that the present schema of things is passing and will be replaced by Christ's visible rule in the next *kosmos* (arrangement or schema), the millennium. Even so, there remains some difficulty. (a) *Kosmos* is not the usual word for the contrast between the present age and the age to come. The usual word is *aiōn*. In 1 John 2:17, where also the *cosmos* is passing away, the reference is more to universal flux, to conditions obtaining throughout the Old Testament as well as now, rather than to one particular future change. Indeed, the contrast is not with a temporally limited millennium, but with an abiding forever. (b) Also, as was noticed before, in these early chapters of 1 Corinthians, Paul does not seem to have the second advent in mind. Nevertheless the idea could have occurred to him here, for it is certainly present in chapter 15. Yet again, would this imply that no one from Paul's day to the twentieth century should get married?

Further against the Parousia, Paul mentions the present distress in 7:28, and again in 7:32; he wants them to be free from anxiety. Thus the context on both sides of the verse relates to impending persecution.

Well, then, if it must be the present necessity, and yet cannot be, and if all the other possibilities are impossible, what can the verse mean? Apparently, the best solution is to suppose that Paul momentarily had all three ideas in mind, but that his advice does not apply equally to all. The advice on marriage applies only to the immediate persecution; the principle of noninvolvement applies to all the time to the Parousia; and a vaguer and more general reference to universal flux contrasts the "change and decay in all around I see" with the divine immutability and parallels Old Testament passages such as Psalms 78:39, 90:10, and 103:15-16.

32-34 "I wish you to be free from care. The unmarried

man cares for the things of the Lord, how to please the Lord. But the married man cares for the things of the world, and he is distracted. And the unmarried woman [i.e., widow] and the virgin care for the things of the Lord in order to be holy in body and soul. But the married woman cares for the things of the world, how to please her husband."

Very parenthetically, because verses often shed light on points somewhat far removed from the main idea, notice that the phrase "in body and spirit" favors dichotomy and not trichotomy.

However, as for the main idea, the meaning of the translation above is so clear as to need no explanation. Certain textual problems, however, had to be solved to obtain the translation. Punctuation complicates the difficulty.

None of the readings has an overwhelming preponderance of evidence. The best reading seems to be "... and is distracted. And the unmarried woman and the unmarried virgin . . .," even though "unmarried virgin" is suspiciously redundant. The reading with the next best attestation simply omits "unmarried" with virgin. There are several other readings, differing slightly in wording, but mainly in implied punctuation. Remember that the MSS have no punctuation. It is we, today, who must put in the commas and periods. Here, the important point is whether or not to put a period after *memeristai*. The translation preferred above has so punctuated the verses and translates the Greek verb as "is distracted."

However, other commentators, with the KJ, put a period at the end of 7:33 and read 7:34 as "There is a difference also between a wife and a virgin." This is not very good because (a) the verb *memeristai* would have to be plural, whereas it is singular; (b) the text is bad, for the evidence in favor of "the unmarried woman," not the wife, is very strong; (c) a possible play on words, similar sounds in *merimnai* (cares) and *memeristai*, seems to favor a period after *memeristai*; and further, (d) the main contrast is not between

the wife and the virgin, but between the married (7:33 mentions the husband) and the unmarried. These reasons justify the translation given above.

35 "This I say for your own good, not in order to throw a noose over you, but for unhindered dignity and devotion to the Lord."

This completes the subject of the last few verses and shows that Paul is not issuing a divine command, but is giving inspired advice. Now comes a minor paragraph break with a slight change in subject matter.

36 "But if anyone thinks he exposes his virgin [daughter] to shame, if she be past her prime, and it ought to be so, let him do as he wishes; he does not sin; let them marry."

Meyer believes the disgrace is not in being a spinster, but in being exposed to seduction. However, why a single woman of thirty is more exposed to seduction than a girl of eighteen or twenty, he does not explain. *Hyperakmos*, the flower of her youth, her zeme, her prime, rather suggests that the disgrace is being unmarried. Furthermore, if seduction were the danger, Paul ought to have said, marry her off at once! The more reluctant permission, let them get married, indicates that the disgrace is remaining unmarried.

Paul is reluctant because he adds, "if it ought to be so." There is some need for marriage, though it may be as little "need" as the removal of the daughter's unhappiness. The father then is to arrange the wedding, and this is no sin.

37-38 "But he who stands firm in his heart, having no necessity, who has authority over his own will, and has decided this in his own heart, to keep his own virgin, will do well. Consequently, both he who gives his own virgin in marriage does well, and he who does not marry [her off] will do better."

Parenthetically again, note the use of the word *heart*. Contrary to the popular American form of Christianity, it does not mean *emotion*. Here, it means either intellect or will, or most probably both. The father is firm in his opinion

and decision. He is quite the opposite of emotional. Similarly, the second instance also means judgment or mind.

The sense of the two verses is quite clear, except perhaps for the phrase "having no necessity," which probably indicates the reverse of "if it ought to be so" in the previous verse.

One may note that the Apostle presupposes parental authority with respect to the marriage of daughters—and sons. Remember that Abraham sent his servant to bring home a bride for Isaac.

39-40 "A wife is bound so long as her husband lives. But if the man has died, she is free to be married to whom she wishes; only in the Lord. She is happier, however, if she remain so, in my judgment, and I think I also have the Spirit of God."

Not only does Paul presuppose parental authority, he also asserts that marriage should last "till death us do part." This is another scriptural principle disregarded in America—but marriage is only for life. When one partner dies, the other is free to marry anyone she or he chooses—providing the new marriage is "in the Lord," in other words, outside the limits of consanguinity and affinity, and within the limits of the Christian populace.

Then Paul, presumably returning to "the present necessity," repeats that a person will be happier unmarried. Why he says "I think I *also* have the Spirit of God" is unclear. It may be a reference to the agitators in Corinth who claimed to have more of the Spirit of God than Paul had, and who may have given different advice. Yet the problem of the false teachers has by now receded considerably into the background, and one cannot be sure that this is what Paul had in mind.

What this chapter says about marriage is fairly clear; but it does not say all that needs to be said. Let us consider a not too hypothetical case. John and Mary were married; she soon deserted him for no good reason. In time, John married Jane

and after fifteen years of happy married life, they were still living happily with three children. None of these people was Christian. Now, it happened at the end of the fifteen years, that John was converted and wished to join a good biblical church. If he had been an habitual thief, the pastor and session would have told him to bring forth fruits meet for repentance, stop his thieving, and then he could unite with the church—but he had not been a thief. For fifteen years, he had been living in adultery. Note that Mary, his first wife, was more larcenous than licentious, had never married again, and was not known to have committed adultery. So, on Christian principles, John was still bound to her. Should the pastor and session tell him to leave his present wife and three happy children and try to reestablish his original marriage or, since that seemed impossible, at least to leave his family and live alone?

Perhaps some pastor would argue that regeneration wipes out past sins, and therefore he need not leave his present family, but this argument not only fails to apply to adultery the same principles that would unquestionably be applied to theft, but it also runs into a most amazing implication. If regeneration wipes out past sins, so that John is no longer an adulterer, then it follows that although John no longer commits adultery with Jane, Jane, still not converted, commits adultery with him. The same act, therefore, is adultery for one spouse and is not adultery for the other. Can the session recommend that John live with an adulteress?

This is not an artificial impossible case. There must be a dozen such in every city of some size. If there are not, it must be because not many such men are converted and that not many churches wish to find biblical solutions for moral problems. The problem is simple enough, indeed there is no problem for anyone who cares little about divine standards of morality and holiness.

Summary: Christians may without sin eat meat that has been offered to idols, for idols are nothing. Some Christians still think that such eating is an acknowledgment of the pagan god. These persons should not eat such meat; nor should more mature Christians eat it in their presence, for this encourages the weaker brother to sin.

1-3 "Concerning sacrifices to idols, we know that all of us have knowledge. Knowledge makes [a man] conceited; but love edifies. If anyone thinks he knows anything, he does not yet know as he should. But if anyone loves God, he is known by him."

Idolatrous practices naturally permeated pagan society. The part of a sacrifice given to the priest was often sold in the butcher shops. Hence, these questions: Should a Christian eat such meat in his own home; should he eat it in a heathen temple; should he eat it in another person's house; and should he eat it in the presence of other Christians? The answers to these questions begin here; and after a parenthetical chapter, the subject is resumed.

There are difficulties in exegesis. The first verse says, "We know that we all have knowledge." However, the second verse weakens this by saying that no one knows as he ought, and worse, 8:7 seems to contradict 8:1 by saying that not everybody has knowledge. A similar contradiction occurs when Romans 1:21 says that the heathen know God and I Corinthians 1:21 says that they do not know God. While orthodox Christians today are on the defensive against allegations of contradictions in the Bible, it is unlikely that even a liberal, if he is seriously interested, would fail to suspect that Paul had something relatively consistent in mind and was

innocent of crass stupidity. The conservative Bible student wants to discover the consistency.

A suggestion found in more than one commentator is that the word *all* (*pantes*) in 8:1 refers to us more mature Christians. However, there is no such hint in the verse. One can hardly suppose that "we all" means only the apostles; for if it did, the second half of the verse would convict the apostles of conceit.

Olshausen tried to distinguish between *gnōsis* (knowledge) in 8:1 as a general ground of knowledge or some general principle, and *hē gnōsis* in 8:7 as *this* particular knowledge; but this distinction is ruled out by the first phrase of 8:1, which specifies a certain particular knowledge, and also by 8:4 where the same particular recurs.

Another suggestion is that 8:1 is speaking of theoretical knowledge and 8:7 has to do with practical knowledge. That is to say, all Corinthian Christians know theoretically that there is only one God and that idols are nothing; yet this knowledge is not practical in the persons whose actions this knowledge does not control. However, the text does not seem to say this.

A slightly better suggestion would have it: we all have *some* knowledge, especially the particular knowledge about sacrifices to idols; but *this* knowledge (*hē gnōsis*) by itself puffs a man up. This makes good sense; but once again the text is against it. *Hē gnōsis* ordinarily means knowledge in general, the universal concept of knowledge, rather than the particular concept of this one piece of information. Further, *hē agapē* (love), a parallel construction, clearly cannot mean this love or some love, but love in general. Nor does this interpretation explain how all have it in 8:1 and not all have it in 8:7.

There are still other difficulties. If knowledge as such (*hē gnōsis*) makes a man conceited, what can an evangelical with his principle of *sola Scriptura* do with II Peter 1:2-3, "Grace . . . be multiplied to you in [the] knowledge of

God . . . who has granted us all things necessary for life and piety by knowledge . . ."? In addition, there are similar verses in John's writings: How can knowledge as such cause conceit when it is the means necessary to life and piety?

A still better attempt is to modify the universal "we all know" by the limitation of 8:2, "If anyone thinks (present indicative) he knows something," he doesn't quite. This parallels 3:18 above and is similar to Galatians 6:3, "if anyone thinks he is something when he is not." This interpretation could possibly allow 8:1 to be taken as sarcasm: We all know, don't we, oh yeah!

Somehow devout people hesitate to think that Jesus or Paul could have ever been sarcastic. However, John the Baptist was surely sarcastic in Matthew 9:13. Sarcasm, therefore, is not to be ruled out, in spite of some objections. One might say that *oidamen* (we know) in 8:4 is parallel with the *oidamen* in 8:1, and since 8:4 is not sarcastic, 8:1 cannot be. The objection is poor, however, for 8:4 is hardly parallel, because (1) 8:2 supports the idea of sarcasm, and (2) 8:3-4 separates the second *oidamen* from the first.

The result is that one cannot tell whether 8:1 is sarcastic or not. Since it could be, the allegation of contradiction fails. Further, if 8:1 is not sarcastic, 8:2 can still be taken very reasonably as a modification of 8:1, and the allegation again fails.

The modification is indeed very reasonable. A person who is conceited because of his academic training knows nothing as he should. Einstein, not a Christian, was very modest and asserted that man would never know how nature really works. Chaim Tschernowitz quotes Einstein in a conversation: "We know nothing about it at all. Our knowledge is but the knowledge of school children. . . . We shall know a little more than we do not. But the real nature of things—that we shall never know, never" (*Readers Digest*, Aug. 1972, p. 28).¹ Note that

1. To the same effect see *The Philosophy of Science and Belief in God*, G. H. Clark, The Trinity Foundation, 1987 (1964).

Einstein, like Paul, both asserts and denies knowledge within the space of a paragraph. No contradiction is involved.

The final phrase of 8:3 needs some explanation too. The meaning ordinarily adopted is: If a man loves God, this man is known by God. However, the word *houtos* regularly refers to the nearest antecedent (as *celui-ci* in French). Taken so, the sentence means: If a man loves God, God is known by the man. This would correspond to 1 John 4:7-8, "Everyone who loves has been born of God and knows God. He who does not love, does not know God." In addition to the grammatical usage of *houtos* and in addition to the parallel in 1 John, one can defend this interpretation by noting that the other meaning involves the superfluous statement that God knows this man. After all, God is omniscient and knows everything. There is no point in saying so here.

Nevertheless, commentators are not likely to be favorably impressed. They will find reasons to make *houtos* refer to the more remote antecedent. Then, the verse will say: "If a man loves God, this man is known by God." The difficulty about omniscience is easily removed. Biblical usage allows us to translate the verb *know*, when God is the knower, as *choose* or *approve*. For example, Psalm 1:6 says that "God knows the way of the righteous." This does not mean that God is ignorant of the way of the wicked. Rather, it means that God approves. Accordingly, in the present verse, God approves of the man who loves him. Some commentators argue further that if God approves of a man, this approval guarantees the man's knowledge, but this leads us into further difficulties. Though it may be true in some sense that love produces knowledge, the more basic principle is that knowledge is a prerequisite for love because no one can love an unknown object.

The text, itself, is too brief to rule out completely some form of this second and common interpretation, but the grammar, the position of the *houtos*, rather clearly favors the first, and refers to man's knowledge of God.

These last two verses have now become parenthetical, and in the next verse, Paul returns to the main thought.

4 "So then, concerning the eating of idol sacrifices, we know that there is no idol in the world and that there is no God but one."

"We know" (*oidamen*) in a sense repeats the *oidamen* of 8:1, but it is not strictly parallel and cannot be used to rule out sarcasm at the beginning. It is not parallel because the object of knowledge is not the same in the two verses. Above, we knew that we all had knowledge. Here, we know that there is no idol in the world.

It is tempting to translate the last phrase as, "we know that an idol is nothing in the world." Yet it seems patently untrue that there are no idols, for we can see them on the street corners in Corinth and in the temples. They are not "nothing," for they are made of stone, wood, or silver.

Furthermore, *ouden eidolon* and *ouden theos* appear to be parallel constructions. However, one cannot translate the latter phrase as "a God is nothing." Hence, one must say, "there is no idol and there is no God."

As for the literal falsehood, which, as noted before, characterizes both translations, one can reply that by the word *idol*, Paul means the gods they represent. That is to say, Zeus, Ares, Poseidon, etc. do not exist—there are no such gods at all.

Yet, Paul does not mean that the Greeks sacrifice to nothing, for in 10:20 below, he asserts that the Gentiles sacrificed to demons. These exist though Zeus does not.

This passage is one of several that shows how wrong the Romanists are in their defense of using graven images in their worship. They wish to define idolatry as the worship of the stone image itself. If one bows before the idol, but at the same time understands that it only represents God or a saint, it is not idolatry, according to the Romanists. Now, these Corinthian Greeks recognized that the stone idol was not itself Zeus. When the silversmiths at Ephesus saw their trade

diminishing and called on Great Artemis of the Ephesians, they and all the mob realized the silver images were only reasonable facsimiles of the wooden image that Artemis, herself, had thrown down from heaven. The pagans knew, as clearly as the Romanists, that the idol was not itself the god. So did Jereboam when at the beginning of the northern kingdom, he erected two golden calves to represent Jehovah. Therefore, if Romanism were right, neither the Ephesians nor the northern Israelites could have been idolaters, but this is precisely what Exodus and I Corinthians condemn.

5-6 "For even if there are so-called gods, either in heaven or on earth; as there are gods many and lords many; nevertheless for us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things and we are for him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and we through him."

The first phrase can mean either (1) the heathen imagine that there are many gods, though they do not really exist, for there is only one God; or (2) some beings are called gods, whereas they are really demons, so for us and for fact there is but one God. The second interpretation is the better one because the phrase "as there are many gods" admits the existence of such beings.

The present writer had an interesting conversation with a Jehovah's Witness. After his standard assertion that John 1:1 means that Christ is a god, I asked him how many gods there were. He replied that this verse in I Corinthians teaches that there are many gods. He did not see that he was putting Christ in the class of demons.

In 8:6, the two occurrences of "all things" should perhaps be rendered "the universe." *Ta panta* is the regular Greek philosophical term for the universe. Either way, the verse says that all things came from God. It does not then say that we also came from God, nor, as the KJ has it, that we are in Him. It is true that we came from God; it is true that we are in Him, for we live and move and have our being in God (Acts 17:28). However, this verse says that we exist for

Him and to serve His purposes. God created all things for the purpose of displaying his manifold wisdom (Eph. 3:9-10). Popular religion frequently speaks as if God existed for our purposes, as if God were a valet. The idea was expressed by the French free-thinker, who said of course God would forgive him—*c'est son métier*—that's his job—but it is false that God exists for man's sake. The scriptural position is that God both created the clay and then, like a potter, fashioned it to suit Himself (Rom. 9:21-23).

The verse continues: "and one Lord Jesus Christ through whom or by whom the universe exists." *Dia* with the genitive is instrumental. We are justified *by means of* (*dia pisteōs*) faith, not on the basis of faith (*dia pistin*, *dia* with the accusative). Thus Christ, the Logos or Wisdom of the Father, is the instrument He used in creation. The persons of the Trinity are *essentially* equal, and Christ is *autotheos*—God in His own right. However, there is a functional subordination.

Then the verse ends: "and we by him." This phrase requires some slight explanation. It is also a case of *dia* with the genitive, but the agent, His means, and His purpose should be specified. The Father is no doubt the agent, Christ is the means, but how are "we" (*hēmeis*) the end? Cowles reduces the sense to the idea that man as well as the physical universe was created. This is flat and repetitious. Furthermore, *ta panta* in Greek philosophy is not limited to the physical and especially to the inanimate universe, and much less should it be so limited in the New Testament. How then does one explain *hēmeis*?

The plural pronoun occurs three times in this verse. The first instance is: "For us there is one God." Obviously, the persons referred to are Christians in strong contrast with the pagans. The second instance, "and we for his purposes," could refer to all human beings because (1) what is said is true of heathen and Christians alike and (2) the reference to creation is all inclusive. Still, Paul probably had Christians in mind. The third instance, the one that needs explanation, is

also attached to the idea of creation and so might refer to all persons. However, it seems better to restrict it to Christians. If it meant all mankind, not only do we have the flat and repetitious interpretation of Cowles, but we fail to place enough significance on the words, "one Lord Jesus Christ." If the title "Christ" stood alone, one could possibly understand His agency in creation, but with the additional title "Lord," the soteriological work of Jesus is surely intended. Therefore, the phrase must be taken as: Not only is the Lord Jesus the agent in creation, it is also He who makes us Christians. The fact that Paul does not mention the Holy Spirit hardly bears on this interpretation. The context, concerned with the idols as it is, does not necessitate such a mention and, as often in this epistle, so here Paul omits an item that would not have particularly advanced his purpose.

7 "But [this] knowledge is not in all; but some [Christians] even yet accustomed to idols eat as a sacrifice to the idol, and their conscience because weak is defiled."

The question of knowledge was discussed above. Clearly this verse does not refer to knowledge in general. It has to do with *this* knowledge. *This* knowledge cannot be a knowledge of creation as mentioned in 8:6, nor immediately a knowledge of the gods and demons in 8:5, but rather all of 8:4-6 because the remainder of 8:7 specifies idol sacrifices. The weak Christians did not know that the meat was just meat and nothing more. They regarded it as sanctified to the idol with the result that when they ate it, as they sometimes did, they worshipped the idol and so violated their consciences. Their consciences were, of course, wrong. Had they known more theology, they could have eaten without self-reproach. However, though their consciences were wrong, it was also wrong to violate them. Paul's problem here was double. Obviously, he had to instruct these ignorant Christians so that they could eat this meat without sinning, but he also had to protect them in their immature condition and prevent them from worshipping idols by an action that, properly understood, was no sin at all.

8 "But food will not present [commend] us to God; for neither are we inferior if we do not eat, nor superior if we do."

No doubt in Paul's day, and certainly in the past century, people who had superstitious quirks of conscience have thought themselves superior Christians because they refrained from doing this or that when more "worldly" Christians did not refrain. It is also true that strong Christians—strong because they were not bound by such scruples—congratulated themselves on their strength and turned up their noses at their weaker brethren. However, insofar as it is a matter of doing or not doing this or that, both groups are wrong. Neither doing nor abstaining commends us to God. That is to say, these choices are morally neutral. In God's sight, it makes no difference how we decide.

Of course, "doing this or that" refers to matters that are neither commanded nor forbidden by divine law. Obviously, Paul does not imply that adultery or incest makes no difference. He is considering choices that lie outside the sphere of morality.

On the other hand, while food is a matter of indifference, and while abstaining from certain foods is not wrong, abstaining from them for conscience' sake is wrong. The weaker Christian lacks knowledge and is immature; his conscience should be corrected and strengthened. Again, while food is indifferent, and there is nothing wrong in eating it, eating it for the sake of displaying one's knowledge rather than for nourishment or taste, is also wrong. This line of conduct or, more specifically, this motivation is what Paul calls conceit or being puffed up.

In view of the fact that Paul so clearly indicates that some choices are not moral choices, that one with good conscience can do either this or that, is it wise for popular Christian leaders to tell young people that "God has a plan for your life" and that one should take care to find it? Then, the teen-ager worries whether God would have him become a

stockbroker or an automotive engineer, or whether he should marry the blonde or the brunette? Paul says that it makes no difference—do what you like; only in the second example, the blonde and the brunette must both be Christians. Otherwise, it makes no spiritual difference; neither choice pleases God more than the other.

9-10 "Nevertheless see that this your right [to make either choice] does not become an obstacle to weak [Christians]. For if someone sees you, who have knowledge, reclining in an idol's temple, will not the conscience of him who is weak be encouraged to eat the idol sacrifice?"

No immature teen-ager is likely to have his conscience damaged by another's choice of automotive engineering rather than brokerage, but in cases where a certain type of conduct has, because of intention, been sin, this conduct, even devoid of sinful associations, when chosen by a mature Christian, can be a temptation to the ignorant Christian. The latter sees the former reclining, as was the ancient position, at the banquet table, and against his conscience also reclines and eats, that is, he intentionally honors the idol. In such a case, the mature Christian has contributed to the other's sin.

Eating in the idol's temple is doubtless worse than buying the meat in the butcher shop and taking it home. The question is again discussed in 10:19 ff. There it will seem that taking the meat home is allowable, but eating it in the temple is not.

11-13 "For the weak [Christian] is destroyed by your knowledge, the brother for whom Christ died. And thus, sinning against your brothers and wounding their weak conscience you sin against Christ. Therefore if food scandalizes my brother, I will never eat meat ever, in order that I may not scandalize my brother."

Introduced by *gar* (for), 8:11 is a reason for something, but hardly a reason for 8:10. Therefore, KJ suppresses the *gar*. This is wrong, for the verse is indeed a reason for something. Indeed 8:10-11 give a double reason for 8:9 which is,

"Do not let your right become an obstacle" *because* (1) the weak conscience will be defiled and *because* (2) the weak Christian will be destroyed.

Among other things, there is here a lesson in human psychology. One would think that a superstitious person, who perchance avoids black cats, would react rather strongly against the rational adult who deliberately gets the black cat to cross his path in order to explode the superstition. Would not such an action make the superstitious person all the more scrupulous? Add to this the strong religious motive of avoiding idolatry, and it becomes hard to understand how the weak Christian could be induced to commit what he considers a serious sin. Would he not instead regard the strong Christian as really weak and worldly, expostulate with him, and be strengthened in his weakness? Unfortunately, weak Christians and all others, at times, are not fully rational and are, as a matter of fact, induced by bad logic to violate their consciences. Thus by one man's knowledge, the ignorant brother is destroyed.

However, is it possible to destroy a weak brother for whom Christ died? Does not Christ hold this brother in His hand so that no one can pluck him out, and is not the Father greater than all so that no one can pluck him out of my Father's hand? How then can my knowledge destroy an ignorant Christian?

It is to be noted that the verb *destroy* (*apollutai*) is one that is used for utter destruction. We met it in 1:18; we shall meet it again in 15:18. Compare also Matthew 5:29-30; John 3:15-16; Acts 5:37; Romans 2:12; II Peter 3:6, 9; and ninety-two references in all.

Charles Hodge, confident that of all whom the Father gave Him, Christ would lose none, refers to Paul's companions in shipwreck. It was predestined that none should drown, but Paul warns them that they would drown *unless* they stayed in the ship. Thus the warning itself prevented their drowning.

However, the warning in the present passage, although it may prevent the destruction of some weak Christians, does not say that it will prevent destruction in every case. The warning here is not addressed to those in danger of perishing, as in the case of the shipwreck. It is addressed to mature Christians who indeed should obey it but who might not. Therefore, the passage seems to suggest that some have been or will be destroyed.

Hodge also says that there is a sense in which Christ died for every human being, so that the persons in question here may not have been truly converted. However, this suggestion is poor because the text explicitly refers to the person as a brother.

There are several other poor suggestions. One is that eating meat, a thing indifferent, would not merit hell, so that the verb here does not mean final destruction. Whether or not the verb means final destruction (and at least it does so frequently enough), to sin against conscience, even though the conscience be mistaken, is a sin that merits hell.

Another poor suggestion is that 8:11 is a question and hence not an assertion. However, even if it is a question, as the KJ has it, (1) it is a rhetorical question with the force of an assertion, and (2) there is no necessity for taking it as a question at all—it states a reason.

A much better attempt is to examine the verb *apollumi* and determine whether in every case it means destruction in hell. We have seen that it often does, but let us look at some of the other ninety-two instances. In Matthew 10:42 and Luke 15:4, 8, 9, 24, 32 and 33, it means "lose": to lose a coin, to lose a son. Luke 15:17 refers to perishing of hunger. Compare Matthew 5:29, 30; 9:17; John 6:12; II John 8; and others.

The conclusion is that since the lost coin was later found, there is no linguistic reason to suppose that *apollumi* has to mean final, irretrievable destruction in hell. Therefore, only those who want to invent a contradiction in the Bible will so understand it.

In order not to sin against a Christian brother, and so sin against Christ, Paul declares, "if food causes my brother to sin, I will not eat meat ever." Remember, though, that Paul condemned Peter for his hypocrisy when he stopped eating meat in order to appease the ignorant consciences of the Judaizers in Antioch. If we defer to every superstitious scruple, not only would our own lives become uncomfortably restricted, but worse, we would be encouraging superstition. Was not the Jerusalem Council a rebuke to those whose consciences told them that Christians had to be circumcised? The situation is puzzling for in Galatians 2:3, Paul forbade the circumcision of Titus, but Paul, himself, circumcised Timothy in Acts 16:3 "because of the Jews that were in" Lystra and Iconium. Are we not caught on the dilemma's horns? Either we cause the weak brother to sin by confirming his heretical superstitions or we cause him to sin by enticing him to act against conscience. The subject is further pursued in chapter 10, and it may be pedagogically wise to let the reader stew with the meat until then.

9

Some pages back, a liberal view was mentioned that resolved the two Corinthian epistles into a patchwork culled from four original letters. One piece of evidence alleged was this ninth chapter. It makes a complete break with chapter eight and then chapter ten continues chapter eight. Hence, some scribe must have cut out this chapter from a lost letter and inserted it here.

Now, if the break is as sharp as this liberal view requires, the scribe must have been exceedingly stupid to insert it here. What is worse, it becomes impossible to account for its inclusion in all existing MSS. On the other hand, if the break is not so sharp, and if there is some reason and continuity to it, the liberal view is without foundation.

In support of the conservative position, two things should be noticed. (1) There is indeed a break, but it is not so absolutely sharp as the liberal theory requires. For that matter, the epistle is full of breaks: factions, incest, law suits, marriage, one subject after another. Hence no suspicion should arise here. Then, (2) chapter ten does not return so fully to chapter eight as to require chapter nine to be regarded as a purely parenthetical insertion, and (3) there is the subsidiary consideration that while an author can feel free to make such breaks as he desires, an editor who wanted two letters to look like one would take care to construct a plausible continuity.

The connection between eight and nine lies in the concept of a Christian's rights. If a Christian has rights, so has an apostle. Hence the subject will be Paul's rights. They had been questioned.

1-27 Summary: In answer to criticisms, Paul asserts his rights: to marry, to receive a salary, or to decline it. Either course is legitimate for a Gospel preacher. Paul prefers the

hardship of no salary, as he also accepts other hardships for the Gospel's sake. Otherwise, he might fail to win the prize.

1-2 "Am I not free? Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen the Lord Jesus? Are you not my work in the Lord? If to others I am not an apostle, I certainly am to you; for you are my seal of apostleship in the Lord."

The connection between this and the previous chapter, as we just saw, is somewhat of a problem. In addition, chapter nine by itself presupposes matters not explicitly mentioned. It is clear that some people in Corinth were attacking Paul: some may have denied his apostolic status; others found fault with various of his policies; and possibly what some objected to, others approved of and vice versa. The situation was serious enough to need a statement from Paul.

The *Textus Receptus* (essentially Erasmus' edition of the New Testament), against the best MSS, which Erasmus did not have, reads, "Am I not an apostle? Am I not free?" Not only is this the poorer reading, it also makes the break sharper than it is, and it changes a good sense into something illogical. Chapter eight had discussed the rights of Christians. Paul was a Christian and enjoyed the same rights as others; but he was also an apostle, and therefore had additional prerogatives. To put *apostle* first and *free* second makes an anticlimax.

The particular right that Paul wants to discuss is the right to receive remuneration for his ministerial services. He also wishes to defend his relinquishment of this right. Though this is different from the exact situation in the previous chapter, the principle is much the same; so there is no need to hypothesize a clumsy insertion by a stupid scribe. Incidentally, not all scribes were stupid, contrary to the impression liberals manage to make.

"Am I not free?" Here, Paul claims whatever freedoms Christ gives to His people. In 9:19 below, this includes a freedom from men, which nonetheless Paul resigns to become the servant of all in order to gain some.

"Am I not an apostle?" This at least suggests that some Corinthians had denied it—a supposition that receives strong confirmation in the next few lines. Paul met similar opposition in Galatia. Here, he defends his apostleship on two grounds. (1) "Have I not seen the Lord?" To have seen the resurrected Christ was a prerequisite to being an apostle (Acts 1:22). Paul's claim to have seen the Lord (since he presumably had never seen Jesus before the crucifixion, and it would be immaterial if he had) refers to his journey to Damascus; and this implies that his experience then was neither a vision nor a dream, and much less an epileptic seizure (epileptics do not remember what happens during a fit); but rather that the incarnate, risen Christ actually returned from Heaven to speak to him. (2) Paul's second argument in defense of his apostleship contrasts Corinth with other cities: "If to others I am not an apostle": This might mean merely "If I was not the apostle who founded their churches," though I did happen to visit them. However, perhaps it is better to refer it to cities Paul never visited. Residents of such cities might doubt that he was an apostle; but how could the Corinthians with whom he had worked for at least a year and a half? The Corinthian church was the seal of his apostleship, the stamp of God's approval, so obviously that the main body of Christians there would have to rebuke Paul's detractors.

3 "My apology to those who question me is this."

Grammatically, "this" can refer to what precedes or to what succeeds. Since it is the last word in the sentence, one might suppose it to refer to what follows.

A choice between these two grammatical possibilities depends on the interpretation of the passage. If *apologia* is his defense of his apostleship, then 9:3 completes 9:2, for 9:4 ff. do not give any defense of his apostleship. However, the criticism was directed at both his apostleship and his conduct. If *apologia* has to do with a defense of his conduct, then 9:3 introduces what follows.

Findlay, in the *Expositor's Greek NT* argues: if Paul

could prove his apostleship, his rights follow automatically. So they do; but while Paul's rights follow logically from his apostleship, the Corinthians, in their various opinions, needed some convincing. As a matter of fact, Paul spends some time defending his rights, no matter how automatic the logic is. In 9:1-2, Paul has defended his apostleship; in 9:4 ff. he defends his rights.

This leaves the sense of 9:3 somewhat up in the air, but however *basic* apostleship may be, the main subject, continued from chapter eight, is *rights*, and therefore it is a little better to use 9:3 as an introduction to what follows.

4-6 "Do we not have a right to eat and drink? Do we not have a right to travel with a sister [Christian] wife as also the other apostles, and the brother of the Lord, and Cephas? Or do I only and Barnabas have no right not to work?"

Paul begins the defense of his conduct by asking a rhetorical question that can only be answered in the affirmative: of course everybody has the right to eat and drink. Nobody is under a moral obligation to starve himself to death. This type of introduction, by requiring an affirmative answer, is a method to prepare for acquiescence in whatever follows.

Grosheide has a different interpretation. He thinks Paul is referring to the right to eat meat offered to idols. This is a poor suggestion because (a) the chapter has nothing to do with meat offered to idols, and (b) since eating meat offered to idols was a matter of dispute, it would not evoke the strong affirmative answer to an introductory rhetorical question.

The first interpretation therefore is the better one, but with a modification: Paul is not concerned with starving to death. His point becomes clear a few verses below: Does he not have the right to eat, therefore to buy food, with money contributed by the churches? The argument concerns the legitimacy of a paid ministry.

To be married and to travel with a wife is another apostolic right. The brothers of Jesus exercised this right. Who

were these brothers? Acts 1:14 expressly distinguishes the brothers of the Lord from the twelve; though James became prominent and is almost called an apostle in Galatians 1:19. All of them, or at least most of them were married, as the present verse makes clear. These brothers of the Lord were the actual brothers of Jesus, sons of Joseph and Mary. The Romish elevation of celibacy, so contrary to the Old Testament and Jewish thought, led to the position that Jesus was not merely Mary's *first-born* son, as Matthew 1:25 and Luke 2:7 say, but her *only* child. In addition to the several verses that speak of Jesus' brothers, Matthew 1:25, again, not only uses the term *first-born*, but definitely indicates that after the birth of Jesus, Joseph and Mary lived a normal married life.

The Romish elevation of celibacy has always been a source of scandal. For some time prior to the Nicene Council, priests and monks misinterpreted these verses by reducing "sister-wife" to "sister-woman"; and they lived with nuns as helpers or maids. The Nicene Council and later councils condemned this practice. In the twentieth century Roman church, too, celibacy remains a source of trouble.

However, the chief subject of the paragraph is not the right to be married, but the right to receive remuneration. So, perhaps a little abruptly, this is introduced by the words, "Or do I only and Barnabas have no right not to work?" Apparently, Paul's detractors asserted that Paul had no right to cease from tent making and accept the contributions of the church. The other apostles could receive remuneration, but Paul and Barnabas alone had no right to stop working. There now follow three examples of the right to be paid.

7 "Does anyone ever go to war at his own expense? Who plants a vineyard and does not eat its fruit? Or who shepherds a flock and does not eat the milk of the flock?"

These examples from ordinary secular business show that Paul's detractors apply standards to him that they would never apply in other matters.

8-9 "Do I say these things as [merely] human [illustra-

tions]? Does not even the law say these things? For in the law of Moses it is written, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox while he is threshing. But God is not concerned with oxen, is he?"

Although the three examples are taken from nonecclesiastical occupations, Paul does not use them as a mere empirical induction. His appeal is to Scripture. The explicit command is found in Deuteronomy 25:4. Deuteronomy 20:6 refers to a man using the fruit of his vineyard, and even excuses him from military service if he has not yet enjoyed the fruit of a newly planted vineyard. That the soldier does not go to war at his own expense is hinted at in Deuteronomy 20:14, 19-20, and is at least presupposed in the later books.

The divine intent of the law concerning oxen, and by implication many other laws, is alluded to in the question. God does not concern Himself with oxen, does He? The NAS has a good idea in using "does he" to indicate rhetorical negative questions. Its constant repetition in the NAS becomes artificial and tedious, but as an occasional translation nothing better can be found.

The negative rhetorical question requires the answer. No, of course not—God does not concern Himself with oxen. Now, of course, God concerns Himself with everything; and the ordinary force of the negative question is modified in the next verse.

10 "Or does it say this *pantōs* for our sake?"

Pantōs can mean absolutely, surely, presumably, probably, certainly, altogether (see below in 9:22). Since the Mosaic law spoke not only of oxen; but of the care of other animals too, we must not suppose that Deuteronomy 25:4 has absolutely no bearing on animals. We must, however, see that the divine intent included mankind as well. The verse should read, "Or does it surely say this for our sake?" The next sentence answers in the affirmative.

KJ and RSV make *God*, not *it*, the subject of the verb. God is the nearest antecedent and so there is some reason for

this translation. However, the written law forms the context on both sides of this sentence, and one cannot *pantōs* rule out such an antecedent.

10b "It was written for our sakes because it is right for the ploughman to plough in hope, and the thresher [to thresh] in hope of sharing."

The reason for the command in Deuteronomy 25:4 is God's provision for profits to be derived from labor. God decreed that this is proper or right. The conclusion will soon follow: if the ox earns his food by working, and if men who plough and thresh do so as well, all the more does God provide a means of livelihood for ministers and apostles.

11-12 "If we have sown spiritual things for you, is it great [too much] if we reap bodily [benefits] from you? If others share this right over you, should not we the more? Nevertheless we did not exercise this right, but we endure all things in order to give no hindrance to the Gospel of Christ."

The argument is perfectly clear, and becomes even more so in the next verse. However, here, there is a local twist to it. Paul's Corinthian detractors acknowledged this right in the cases of other ministers; and denied it only to Paul.

In human affairs, peculiar twists sometimes occur. The Plymouth Brethren do not believe in a paid ministry—in spite of this perfectly clear passage, but for years, one of their number served as pastor for a high salary in a large Chicago church. Now, the Plymouth Brethren are wrong; the gentleman had a scriptural right to his pay; but it is a human twist to accept a good salary while holding the theory of an unpaid ministry.

Paul, however, did not exercise his right. Apparently, his enemies (not only those within the church, but also those in the heathen community) were bitter enough to accuse him of greed.

13-14 "Do you not know that those who work with the sacred things eat of the temple, those who attend the altar partake of the altar? So even the Lord commanded those who preach the Gospel to live of the Gospel."

It might seem that 9:7-11 had already said enough about the right of the minister to receive his living from the congregation. However, apparently the situation required Paul to belabor the point somewhat more. The principle that the priests should eat of sacrificed animals was accepted in heathendom, but Paul naturally refers to the Old Testament. Then he adds: not only is this Old Testament doctrine, but even the Lord, Himself, commanded it in Matthew 10:10. Surely this is indisputably conclusive.

15 "But I made no use of these [privileges]. I did not write these things in order that it should be so in my case, for it would be good for me to die rather than anyone should make my boast void."

Although some commentators want to attach the first sentence of this verse as an abrupt conclusion to what preceded, and make a minor paragraph break after it, it is better to consider verse 14 as the conclusion of the previous argument. Then, verse 15 begins a new paragraph. This will become more evident in the explanation of verses 16-18. The main thought, then, repeated from verse 6 as a new beginning, is, "I made no use of these" privileges defended in verses 7-14. Then comes a parenthetical remark: "I did not write these [verses]" as a request for remuneration. He would rather die. The wording is a little awkward. The Aland text puts a dash after *rather than*, and makes the remaining words an independent interjection: "No one shall void my boast!" However, if there is some reasonable way to avoid an incomplete sentence, it should be preferred. Meyer denies that *rather than* introduces a comparison; and takes *ē* as the Latin *aut*: I shall die *or else* no one shall void my boast. This is worse than the Aland dash. The translation given above seems reasonable.

16-17 "For if I evangelize, I have nothing to boast of. For a necessity is laid upon me. For woe is me if I do not evangelize. For if I do this willingly, I have a reward; but if unwillingly, I have been entrusted with a stewardship."

Here are four reasons; four instances of the conjunction *for* in these two verses. It is necessary to see what each of these reasons is a reason for.

"For if I evangelize . . ." is a reason for the first phrase of verse 15. Thus: "I do not use these privileges, for if I evangelize [without pay], I have nothing to boast about." The second *for* explains this last statement: I would have nothing to boast about *because* I am compelled to evangelize. The third *for* explains this last: I am compelled to evangelize, for woe is me if I refuse. The fourth *for*, the first and only one in verse 17, goes back over the parenthetical "Woe is me" to "I have nothing to boast of," and to "I am under necessity." It explains why necessity prevents boasting. Thus: for if I evangelize willingly, that is, if preaching the Gospel were optional with me, I could boast that I chose to preach, but if I have no option and am commanded to preach, then this obligation of stewardship has been laid on me as any owner lays such an obligation on his slave. The slave then cannot boast that he obeys his owner's command. To have a ground for boasting, a man must do something not commanded. Now, while the Lord commanded Paul to preach, He did not command him to preach without remuneration from the churches. This was made clear in verses 7-14. Paul, however, served without pay and so had a ground for boasting.

18 "What then is my reward?" That Paul wanted pay and wanted to boast may sound selfish and reprehensible, but his pay was . . .

18b "That when preaching I shall make the Gospel free of charge so as not to use my right in the Gospel."

The general sense is that Paul's reward was the honor of making the Gospel free of charge by not exercising his rights. The latter words are a bit unusual grammatically. Literally, they mean: *in order to avoid exercising my rights*. However, the idea of purpose fits poorly here. The introductory preposition therefore should be understood as indicating a result: since he intended to make the Gospel free, this intention resulted in his refusing remuneration.

19 "For being independent of all [people], I enslaved myself to all in order to gain more [converts]."

If there was a slight paragraph break at verse 15, there is a more definite break here. The following describes in more detail the manner in which Paul preached without pay. Yet the break is by no means complete, for the verse is a reason, introduced by another *for*, for what preceded. The reason seems to attach to the phrase, "so as not to exercise my rights." The nonexercise of rights is explained or exemplified by his enslaving himself to all.

The words *all* and *more* refer to people. A poor translation might make it say: Being independent of all *things*, I enslaved myself to all people, in order to gain more *pay*. However, the masculine plural *tous pleionas* and the reference to the Jews in the next verse shows that it is converts, not pay (pay is neuter singular), that are meant.

20 "And to the Jews, I became as a Jew in order to gain Jews; to those under [the] law as under [the] law, though I myself am not under [the] law, in order to gain those under [the] law."

The definite article is missing in the Greek text. This is not at all unusual. In the context, with its mention of the Jews in this verse and the mention of the Gentiles in the next verse, the word *law* can only mean the Mosaic law, *the law*.

KJ omits "though I myself am not under [the] law"; yet the textual evidence is decisively, indeed overwhelmingly, in its favor.

21-23 "To those without law [I became] as without law, not being without the law of God but in the law of Christ, in order to gain those without law. To the weak I became weak in order to gain the weak. I became all things to all men in order to save some somehow. I do all things because of the Gospel in order to participate in it with [all other Christians]."

In the previous verse, he refused to eat nonkosher food when he was with Jews, but in this verse, he willingly eats

pork to win the Gentiles. That there be no misunderstanding of the phrase, "without law," Paul states that he is indeed under the law of Christ. He is bound by the moral law. He is, however, free from the penalty of the law because of his redemption and free from ritual law because Christ fulfilled it.

He also became weak — that is, he observed the foolish scruples of some people in order not to prejudice them against the Gospel.

In this regard one must not carelessly subscribe to what must be a common understanding of this passage. A superficial reading may suggest that Paul restricted himself to kosher food in Jewish communities in order to win unbelieving Jews to an acceptance of the Messiah. Then, in a pagan community, he ate pork, or otherwise disregarded the Mosaic laws, in order to convert Gentiles.

No doubt this is so. It has already been said. However, the actual text hints or more than hints at something further. When it says that Paul observed foolish scruples, the reference goes back to the foolish scruples of immature Christians. However, how could Paul save Christians who were already saved? How could he gain them, if he had already gained them?

Well, Paul was not one of these psychological experts who is trained to give a pep talk on four spiritual laws which guarantee conversion in twenty minutes, after which they run off to another Pavlovian dog. Salvation is not an instantaneous affair, nor is regeneration an observable event. Unlike the missionary minded Canadian minister, Paul did not hold that "no one has a right to hear the Gospel twice until everybody has heard it once." Paul knew that salvation is a life-long affair. It does not end with regeneration. For that matter, an evangelist ought not to conclude that a person has been regenerated in his meetings just because the "convert" shows some enthusiasm. If such a person is actually regenerated, sanctification is still a part of salvation. Immature

Christians have to be saved from ignorance and sin. To encourage and accelerate this life-long growth from infancy to maturity, Paul accommodated himself to the new convert's superstitions. This was his policy in all his activity; he became all things to all men in order to save some. Such was his devotion to the Gospel. His reward was to participate in it.

Meyer, who is characterized by the proverbially pedantic and thoroughgoing German scholarship, at this point breaks out amazingly in a beautiful sentence of admiration: "Note the humility of the expression; he who labored more than all others has yet in view no higher reward for himself . . . than just the salvation common to all believers."

24-26 "Do you not know that those who run in the stadium all run, but [only] one receives the prize? Run thus to win. Everyone who contends practices self control—they to win a perishable crown, but we an imperishable: This is the way I run, unambiguously; this is the way I fight, not beating the air; but I give my body a black eye and bring it under subjection, in order that I myself, having preached to others, should not somehow be rejected."

These final verses now include an exhortation to the Corinthians themselves. As Paul runs and fights like those who compete in the Olympic games, so ought the Corinthians; if the athletes practice total self control, so should we who strive for an imperishable reward. This is what Paul had been doing unambiguously (*adēlos*). The word can mean "not aimlessly." However, this hardly makes good sense. Even lax Christians are not entirely aimless. Rather the meaning must be "obviously," "apparent to all," "unmistakably." Paul is calling the attention of the Corinthians to his manner of life. It is clear that he expends the effort of an Olympic champion. He controls his body and hits his opponent square on the jaw. No make believe shadow boxing for Paul, lest somehow he, himself, might lose.

Paul does not really doubt that he will win, but he lives strenuously to prevent the "somehow" from becoming actual.

Summary: The preceding exhortation to self-discipline is strengthened by consideration of the Israelites under Moses. They set bad examples. We must resist such temptations. Especially must we never participate in a heathen sacrifice, though we may eat the meat after it has been sold to the butcher shop. Nevertheless, we should not even then eat it in the presence of one who is plagued by ignorant superstitions.

1-4 "For I do not wish you to be ignorant, brethren, that all our fathers were under the cloud and all passed through the sea, and all were baptized to Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and all ate the same spiritual food, and all drank the same spiritual drink; for they drank from the spiritual rock that followed them, and the rock was Christ."

Here, again, is one of Paul's complicated sentences, extending through four verses. In it, to warn the Corinthians against lax conduct, he begins to describe the experiences of the Israelites under Moses. They had all enjoyed the blessings here mentioned, but as the next verse will say, God was displeased with most of them. The whole four-verse sentence is given as a reason (*for*), a reason for the strenuous propagation of the Gospel. Paul warns against laxity, for laxity ruined most of the people with Moses.

This material from the Old Testament is not to be despised. The events themselves and the fact that they were recorded are parts of God's providence. E. M. Robertson shows his displeasure with God's older revelation and his depreciation of Paul, or of Paul's inspiration, when he says, "His treatment of the OT is a little fanciful, but in the best tradition of a rabbi of his day" (p. 67). His treatment is not fanciful; it is God's own interpretation of what He commanded Moses to write.

Note that Paul says, "all our fathers." Thus, in spite of the fact that many Corinthian Christians were Gentiles, Paul considers the Israelites as their fathers. Indeed, since he says *all* our fathers were with Moses, it follows that Paul does not consider the Gentile biological fathers as their fathers. This ties in with Galatians 3:6-29, where Abraham is said to be the father of all who are in Christ. It also ties in with Galatians 6:16 where the Christian Church is identified as the Israel of God. Emphasis in the present passage is seen in that "all our fathers" is repeated five times. It is passages like these that refute modern dispensationalism with its extreme and impossible separation of the Jewish church (the church in the wilderness, Acts 7:38) from the Gentile church of the New Testament age.

Also interesting is the fact that the Israelites were baptized. Of course, they were baptized into Moses, and not into the Trinity, but there must be some similarity in the two types of baptism. Some Baptists hold that the point of similarity is immersion. At a recent meeting of a theological society, one Baptist argued that the Greek preposition *en* was always locative and never instrumental. Of course, he was wrong. In this epistle, the instrumental *en* has already occurred a dozen times. However, consider the locative principle in this verse: they were baptized *in* the cloud and *in* the sea as one is immersed *in* a river or baptistry. This comparison is impossible because the Israelites were never in the cloud locally. The cloud went before them, or it rested over the ark. At night, the cloud was fire, and this makes a poor comparison with water. Furthermore, the Israelites were never immersed in the sea, as Pharaoh's soldiers were. The Israelites were never in the sea at all: they passed over on dry land (Ex. 14:21-22).

The similarity between Moses' baptism and Christian baptism must be sought in their significance, or in a part of it. In both cases, the baptism is a visible sign that the baptized persons are the disciples of him into whose name they are baptized.

Paul continues with the assertion that they all also ate the same manna from Heaven. However, more interest attaches to verse 4: "And all drank the same spiritual drink, for they drank from the spiritual rock that followed them, and the rock was Christ."

The Old Testament references are Exodus 17:6, Numbers 20:11, and Psalm 78:15. These references do not say that the rock followed them, but later Jewish tradition says so. One passage (cf. Strack und Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum NT aus Talmud und Midrasch*, in loc.) describes the rock as a stone full of holes like a sieve, through which the water trickled or bubbled up in a column. The rock went with them up mountains and climbed with them out of valleys. If Paul knew of this tradition, he might well have wished to correct it by saying that it was Christ who followed the Israelites.

Among Christian commentators, Meyer holds that there was an actual physical rock, but it was a supernatural rock, a rock of heavenly origin, not just a part of the Sinai cliff. This rock was a manifestation of Christ, a sort of incarnation (or *impetration*), "as being his own substantial and efficient presentation of himself to man." Yet we reject, says Meyer, the rabbinical idea that the rock rolled along as they marched. However, neither must we deny that it followed them. Meyer also rejects the view of Calvin and others who say the water followed them, not the rock. *Ên* (Greek verb, was) does not mean *signify*. It did not simply prefigure Christ, nor was it a type of Christ. It was Christ. So Meyer.

Hodge takes a less romantic but more sober view that neither the literal rock nor the water followed them. It was Christ who followed them; and He is figuratively called the rock as in John's Gospel. He is called the vine. What is more important, which Hodge also mentions, is that the preexistent Christ is Jehovah. Note that Jude 5 speaks of Jesus as having saved a people out of Egypt. The better reading is *Jesus*, rather than *Lord*. However, even if it were *Lord*, the person referred to is nonetheless Jesus. Therefore, Jesus is Jehovah.

5-6 "But with most of these God was not well pleased, for they were destroyed in the wilderness. Now these things happened as examples for us in order that we should not be desirous of evils, as those desired."

In spite of all the blessings just mentioned, God was not pleased with most of them. The most obvious exceptions, one can say the only exceptions, were Caleb and Joshua. Even Moses suffered the catastrophe. The word for "destroy" (*katastrophē*) is the root from which the English *catastrophe* comes. It apparently does not mean personal damnation, for Moses was clearly an elect saint. Others also were, but they all suffered disappointment, by never crossing the Jordan into Palestine. There were other punishments, too, along the road.

Verse 6 begins the application of this Old Testament lesson to the Christians of this age. Paul is not indulging in any fanciful interpretation. He is asserting that God had commanded Moses to record these experiences especially for the sake of the New Testament Christians. God knew that the Corinthians would need the warning. So the next few verses spell out in detail what the pertinent bad examples were.

7-10 "Do not become idolaters, as some of them; as it is written, 'The people sat down to eat and drink and stood up to play' (Ex. 32:6). Nor let us be fornicators, as some of them committed fornication, and twenty-three thousand fell in one day. Nor let us try Christ, as some of them tried [him], and were destroyed by the serpents. And do not grumble, as some of them grumbled, and they were destroyed by the destroyer."

The main thrust of this passage cannot be misunderstood. The details are taken from Exodus and Numbers. Verse 7, about sitting down to eat and rising up to play, refers to the golden calf. The idea ties in with the question of meat offered to idols in chapters eight and eleven. Verse 8, about fornication, which is a reminder of chapter five, and the destruction of 23,000, refers to the idols of Moab and the

literal fornication that followed upon the spiritual fornication. Here, it is interesting to note that Numbers 25:9 gives the number destroyed as 24,000.

This is a most peculiar "mistake" to make. Paul surely knew the number found in the Hebrew MSS and in the LXX. The Targums and Midrash have the same number. How then could Paul change it? Since the numbers in both sources are obviously round numbers, some commentators conclude that Moses gave the maximum and Paul gave the minimum. Other less satisfactory attempts have been made.

Verse 9 may say, "try the Lord" or, "try Christ." Lord has the better MSS evidence, although *Christ* is found in the second century papyrus 46, along with other MSS. *Christ* is the harder reading; one can understand how a puzzled scribe could change *Christ* to *Lord*, but not how *Lord* could be changed to *Christ*. In either case, since Christ or Messiah and Lord or Jehovah are names for the same person, this verse is another one that identifies Jesus with the Old Testament Jehovah. The serpents are found in Numbers 21:5-6.

Another interesting point, though trivial, is the imperfect *were being destroyed* in verse 9, and the pluperfect *had been destroyed* in verse 10. The *dēstroyēt* may refer to Numbers 14:2, 36 or Numbers 16:44-49.

11-12 "Those things happened to them as an example, and they were written to warn us, to whom the ends of the ages have come. So let him who thinks he stands see that he does not fall."

Here is some repetition. Once again, as was implied in verse 6, Paul tells us that the events of Old Testament history are examples for us in New Testament times; and that God inspired Moses to record these events, rather than others, or rather than none, for our instruction. The New Testament nowhere disparages the Old Testament. Neither can be understood without the other.

The New Testament era is called "the ends of the ages." Does this mean that our age, the age from the resurrection of

Christ to His return, is the last age, and that therefore there is no millennium? This interpretation might seem attractive to amillennialists, but a premillenarian could reply that the millennium is not an age of "history"; history ends with Christ's return and an eschatological age begins. This is not very convincing. Furthermore, the wording is difficult. What can Paul mean by the *ends* (plural) of the ages? One can understand "the end of an age," or even "the end of all ages"; but why should *ends* be plural? Someone has suggested that *ta telē* be translated "the goals" of all preceding ages. This is not bad, and it can be improved by bringing it into line with Hebrews 9:26: "Now once in the end of the ages he has appeared. . . ." It means that the Corinthian Christians had lived in and had witnessed the completion of the Mosaic and earlier epochs.

13 "A temptation has not seized you, unless a human one; and God is faithful, who will not permit you to be tempted beyond what you can, but will make with the temptation also the escape so that you can bear it."

The first phrase as just translated is crabbedly literal. Surely there is enough leeway for KJ and NAS: "No temptation has taken you but such as is common to man." Since the verb is in the perfect tense, Bengel argues: so far you have had only common temptations, but worse may come. This hardly accords with the tone of the passage. The two future tenses (*will not permit* and *will make*) also militate against this view. Hence the meaning is that God will always provide a way of escape from any temptation any man will ever face. In fact, God does not merely provide "a" way of escape, some random way, but "the" way of escape, a divinely arranged way.

Some people wish to say that God does not "make" or send the temptation; He only "permits" it: what He "makes" is the way to escape. The motivation in distinguishing permission from making is to avoid compromising God's holiness. Somehow the idea of God's permitting evil without decreeing

it seems to absolve God from the charge that he is the "author" of sin, but one must be careful, both with respect to the logic of the argument and to the full scriptural data. God "permitted" Satan to afflict Job; but since Satan could not have done so without God's approval, the idea of permission hardly exonerates God. Is perfect holiness any more compatible with approving and permitting Satanic evil? If God could have prevented, not only Job's trials, but all the other sins and temptations to which mankind is subject—if He foresaw them and decided to let them occur—is He less reprehensible than if He positively decreed them? If a man could save a baby from a burning house, but decided to "permit" the baby to burn, who would dare say that he was morally perfect in so deciding? Furthermore, the present verse says, "God will make with the temptation also the way of escape." It is clear therefore that God *makes* both. The term "permission" is nothing more than a literary device for describing God's use of created agents. Otherwise, there is no difference between a permit and a decree.

It will be remembered that James 1:13 seems to contradict the present verse, as he also seems to contradict the doctrine of justification by faith. If the contradiction is real, verbal inspiration fails, or James must be rejected from the canon. One would have to choose either Paul or James; one could not have both. James wrote, "Let no man say, when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man." The Greek word *tempt* is the same in both passages. Thomas Manton in his *Commentary on James* uses the idea of permission to remove the contradiction; but this does not clearly fit the Corinthian passage. Further, Manton notes that the Bible in several places says that God tempts men: Genesis 22:1, "God tempted Abraham . . ."; II Samuel 24:1, "the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel and he moved David [to sin]"; Psalm 105:25, "He turned their heart to hate his people"; Zechariah 13:7, "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd . . .

smite the shepherd. . . ." Since the Old Testament passages are Hebrew and not Greek, it is impossible to have identical wording, but the thought is unmistakable.

The theological question can be solved only with all the data in mind. To exalt James and repudiate Paul and the Old Testament is illegitimate.

Now, *permission* may distinguish an indirect causation from a direct causation, but permission as a substitute for *decree* does not solve the problem of maintaining God's holiness. Calvin's *Institutes* III xxiii 8 is far more satisfactory. Calvin preserves the idea of God's sovereignty. He makes it clear that God is the Creator and therefore the first cause of all things that exist, that He governs all His creatures and all their actions. Calvin repudiates the permissive theologians' idea of a finite deity. Thus, if God is infinite, any decree He makes is holy for the simple reason that He, the sovereign, makes it.

The full theological expansion of this idea, just briefly indicated here, can be found in other books, but so far as a commentary on 1 Corinthians 10:13 is concerned, God makes both the temptation and the way to escape.

14-15 "Therefore, my beloved, flee from idolatry. I speak [to you] as prudent people. You be the judges of what I say."

Paul here balances a complimentary address with the realities of the situation. He does not say outright that the Corinthians were wise and prudent. He speaks to them as if they were. He asks them to consider things calmly, with good judgment, not emotionally. No doubt some, the pillars of the church, had good judgment. Here, he tries to win over a few more.

The verse, itself, may be taken as the conclusion of the preceding, but it also introduces the remainder of the chapter and ties together the bad examples in the wilderness, the Lord's Supper (more fully considered in the next chapter), and the idolatry in Corinth. Paul may not have been a

literary stylist, but he knew how to put things together logically.

16 "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not participation in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the participation in the body of Christ?"

The cup is mentioned first and the bread second because Paul wishes to speak more about the bread, or what is eaten, in connection with pagan feasts. The cup is a cup of blessing, not because it blesses us as a means of grace, but because we bless it as we set it apart from its secular to its sacred use. By drinking the wine which we have consecrated to God, we participate in, have fellowship with, or hold in common the blood of Christ.

The exact nature of this community Paul does not explain here. Against the Romish and perhaps the Lutheran view, one may note that the Lord's Supper was instituted before the crucifixion. Before He was nailed to the cross, Christ said this is My body. His body had not yet been broken nor His blood poured out. Was then the value and meaning of the original Supper essentially different from its usefulness today? Was the first Supper a sham, or even a mere anticipation? Or rather, must we not reject the Romish theory and follow Calvin?

Further, too, one must note that the bread is broken; and this essential symbol is missing when a priest puts an unbroken wafer into a communicant's mouth. The disciples did not use glucose; they broke a piece of bread off a loaf.

17 "Because the bread is one, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread."

It is better not to say, "Because the bread is one loaf," since the unity indicated is a more qualitative than a numerical unity. The bread is all one sort of stuff, it is all bread; and we are all Christians. We are all Christians because we all eat the same bread.

There is a little grammatical puzzle here. The verb "share" (*metechomen*) regularly governs the genitive without

any preposition. Here, the preposition *from* (*ek*) precedes "the one Bread." Both Liddell and Scott, and Arndt and Gingrich use this one instance to justify using *ek* after *metechō*. However, if this is the only instance in Greek of an object of *metechō* being governed by *ek*, it is desirable to maintain the usual rule of the genitive minus any preposition and to seek some other explanation for the *ek* here. This desideratum can be met by considering the *ek* as an emphasis on the partitive genitive. Thus the expanded meaning would be: each communicant eats a part of the one bread. Thus we all become one body in Christ.¹

18 "Look at Israel according to the flesh: are not those who eat the sacrifices participants at the altar?"

Leviticus 7:15 says, "Now as for the flesh of the sacrifice . . . it shall be eaten on the day of his offering. . . ."

Leviticus 8:31 says, "Boil the flesh at the door of the taber-

1. Readers who are not filled with trepidation at any hint of scholarship, however slight, will find pleasure, profit, and perspective in two paragraphs of Arndt and Gingrich's *Lexicon* (Introduction, p. xxiii). The authors are in process of describing heathen Greek society, customs, and literature that could have and probably did prevent the early Gentile converts from understanding Paul's words. The following quotation is one part of their extensive argument.

"Diog. L. 6, 35 has Pythagoras say that the *enkōmion* (cf. 1 Cor 10:17) had served as a symbol of the bond between *philoi* (friends). Theopompus (in Athen. 4, 51 p. 149 D) tells us about banquets in Arcadia at which the diners gathered about one table on which the food for all was set; likewise they all drank from the same jar. *Koinonía* with the genitive (1 Cor 10:16) is the common possession or enjoyment of something (Diog. L. 7, 124 al.). The eating together of the one loaf, which means the body of Christ (11:24), brings the many together in one body (10:17). We read of communal meals in Crete in the historian Pnygion (Hellenistic times; no. 467 fgm. 1 Jac.) that they were consecrated by the offering of a libation with prayer. . . . When the offering has been made, the food is distributed to all present. . . .

"Is it too bold to look upon the Corinthian sacrificial meal as a Christianized communal dinner at which the consecration was brought about by a calling to mind of what happened on the last evening of Jesus' life? The unseemly conduct Paul condemned (11:17-22) had a strong 'heathen' tone to it." And the paragraph concludes with references to heathen Greeks who also complained against the disorder of their own communal meals. "Erastosthenes . . . waxes bitter over the fact that . . . each one eats what he has brought with him and drinks from his own [idios as in 1 Cor. 11:21] bottle. . . . His judgment is as severe as that of the apostle: 'such a festal meeting is a dirty thing. . . .'"

Contemporary Christians who have a little time would do well to read more of Arndt and Gingrich's Introduction.

nacle of the congregation, and eat it there. . . . Aaron and his sons shall eat it." Deuteronomy 12:18 says, "But thou must eat them before the Lord thy God. . . ."

These verses show that eating the flesh of a sacrifice was an act of religious worship. It was part of the ritual. The point is an essential support to Paul's argument, but if it were left here, misunderstandings would arise, indeed they had already arisen. The immature Corinthians, or some of them, refused to eat any meat that had been offered to idols; but Paul will make a distinction that had not occurred to them.

19-20 "What then am I saying? That a thing sacrificed is anything, or that an idol is anything? [No,] but [I say] that the things the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons and not to a god, and I do not want you to be partners of demons."

In fact, several misunderstandings were and are possible. In addition to the inference, a fallacious inference as Paul explains below, that one should never eat meat that had been used for sacrifice in a pagan temple, it might also be inferred, again fallaciously, that Paul's use of the verses from Leviticus and the customs of the Jews somehow implied the existence of Zeus, Poseidon, and others. Paul denies the existence of such gods as these, but there are demons, and the pagans unintentionally but actually sacrifice to the demons. Hence, Corinthian Christians, in their laxity, could not reply, "we do not intend to worship pagan gods when we attend a feast in the temple; we only want to enjoy the feast." However, Paul's warning is that, even though unintentionally, they are actually engaging in pagan worship. Thus they become partners of demons.

On this verse, Grosheide makes a very good suggestion as to translation, and then falls into interpretative confusion. He writes, "To demons, the absence of the article makes the expression more abstract. The fact that the Gentiles did not bring their sacrifices to the one true God was clear in itself. Therefore we must translate *to a god*, and not *to God*. The

absence of the article before *god* is conclusive proof of the correctness of this translation. The implication of all this is that we must not think of these *demons* as actually existing evil spirits, but as the powers of darkness in general. . . . True, mention is made of evil powers . . . but no personality is attributed to them."

Grosheide's argument well supports his translation, but there is no basis for his conclusion that the demons are impersonal powers rather than actually existing evil spirits. The Bible asserts the personality of Satan and the wicked angels, regardless of modern scientism. There is no reason to deny personality here. In fact, the idea of being a partner with demons requires them to be considered as much a person as their human partner is.

In the last few verses, the verb *metechō* has been translated as "Partake." Partake or share is quite regular. The word *koinōnos* has been translated "partner." The root meaning is "to have something in common," business interests, religious beliefs, or anything. Perhaps some philologist can find an instance where two inanimate things are said to have something in common, the same weight, for example. However, with the exception of "common gold" in the sense of inferior quality, Liddell and Scott, with several hundred listings on *koinos*, *koinos*, and derivatives, seems to have no such example. Even the Stoic term "common notions" refers to ideas that all men have in common. Hence the biblical analogies and the Greek usage are uniformly against impersonal demons.

21-22 "You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons. You cannot partake of [or, share in] the table of the Lord and the table of demons. Or do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than he is?"

The worship of Christ and the worship of demons are incompatible. Christianity and other religions are mutually exclusive. Contrary to the views of William E. Hocking and others who propose a world-religion, there is no common

ground shared by Islam, Buddhism, and Christianity. This is not because polytheism objects to an extra god in the pantheon, but because Jesus said, "No one comes to the Father, but by me"; and because Moses said, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Even polytheism would object to an "extra god," if it fully realized what this extra God is: a jealous God who will not share His glory with another.

Corinthian Christians may have attended feasts in pagan temples because they enjoyed a good meal and were ignorant of the implications; or they may have deliberately concluded that the Greek gods were nothing and that it showed maturity to participate in these feasts; or they may have just been thoughtless and lax. However, the only rational ground a Christian could have for so doing would be a desire to provoke the Lord to jealousy. Such a desire would indeed logically result in going to the feast, but while this desire and this conduct are logically consistent, the desire itself is insane. Are we stronger than God? Can we provoke His jealousy and get away with it? Hence the only reasonable ground for the conduct is a denial of God's omnipotence and a repudiation of Christianity.

23 "All things are permitted; but not all are advantageous. All things are permitted, but they do not all edify."

Here is a slight paragraph break. It is slight, however. Some new ideas, or, better, some extension of the previous ideas are added, but the main thrust is against the misinterpretation of Paul's principles. If these principles can be extended to other situations, nevertheless pagan worship is still the uppermost topic.

Paul begins by saying that all things are permitted. Of course, not all things are permitted. In the previous chapter, Paul has condemned several things very strongly, and just above, Paul has condemned the worship of demons. Unfortunately, many commentaries make no attempt to explain this inconsistency. How could Paul or any other intelligent writer fall into such a contradiction? Now, the very obvious-

ness of the "contradiction" indicates that no contradiction was intended. The linguistic fact of the matter is that when Paul says "all," he frequently does not mean "all." There is often an implicit qualification. For example, when Paul, later in this epistle (15:22) will say, "in Christ shall all be made alive," he does not mean every last human being. It is true, of course, that Christ will raise every last human being who has died; he will raise the just and the unjust. However, the verse, itself, as well as the context forbids this interpretation. Paul is not speaking about resurrection from the grave; he is speaking about being made spiritually alive. The verse clearly refers to salvation from sin, and not all men are so made alive. The qualification, not fully expressed, but still not far beneath the surface, is "all who are in Christ are made alive by him" (cf. Rom. 5:12-21). So too, in the present verse, the meaning is that all things not determined to be sin by divine command are permissible.

24 "Let no one seek his own [advantage] but that of the other."

Meyer insists that we should not reduce the sense of this verse to the lower moral level of Philippians 2:4; but this insistence not only ruins verbal inspiration, it makes nonsense of the verse itself. If we are never to seek our own good, we could not eat breakfast, much less apply to Christ for salvation. Romans 15:1, to which Meyer appeals for confirmation, says nothing so stupid. Lastly, the second great commandment, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," presupposes that a man must love himself. The principle of this verse is not to be restricted to the case in hand, but the case in hand is covered by the universal principle.

25-26 "Everything that is sold in the butcher shop, eat; asking no questions for conscience' sake, for the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof."

This is one of the main conclusions of the argument. Meat offered to idols, after the pagan ceremony was over and when the meat had been put up for public sale, no longer had

any ritual significance. It was nothing other than plain, ordinary meat. For a Christian to inquire whether the meat on sale had indeed come from the temple, rather than directly from the farm, was wrong. A Christian who asked such a question had a bad conscience. Such a Christian fails to understand that the earth is the Lord's.

27 "If any unbeliever invites you [to dinner] and you wish to go, eat everything set before you, asking no questions for conscience' sake."

Here is an extension of the conclusion. The Christian may eat not only the meat he buys in the store, but he may also eat any meat set before him in the home of an unbeliever. His conscience is wrong, if he asks questions. Note also that this permits a Christian to accept an invitation to dinner from a pagan.

28-30 "But if anyone say to you, this is an idol sacrifice, do not eat it; [both] because of the one who informed you and conscience. I mean not your own conscience, but that of the other [Christian]. For why should my freedom be condemned by any other conscience? If I partake with grace, why am I blasphemed for what I give thanks for?"

Now suppose another Christian has also been invited to dinner. Since his conscience is weak, he whispers to you that this Delmonico steak has been offered to an idol. Then, don't eat it. If you ate it, you might encourage him to eat it against his conscience. So, don't eat. Wait until tomorrow and then explain that he has disobeyed Paul's command to eat the meat without asking questions. So doing, you can edify his conscience; and at the next dinner, both of you can eat your steak.

So far the meaning is clear, but 29b and 30 cause a little trouble. The phrase, "For why should my freedom . . ." is a reason for something. Is it a reason for the preceding words of the verse, "not your own conscience, but that of the other"? In this case, the meaning would be: if you refuse to eat because of your own conscience, then the weaker Christian's conscience will condemn you; but if you refuse to eat be-

cause of his conscience, his conscience will not condemn you. However, this meaning is impossible. Both parts are false. The first part is false because in this case, the weaker Christian will commend you; and the second part is false because in this case, the weaker Christian will condemn you—not because you refuse, but because you refuse out of politeness' sake and not by conviction. These implications show that the phrase in question is not the reason why Paul said, "not your own conscience, but that of the other."

In fact, no reason at all need be given to show that Paul means the conscience of the other man. Since the strong Christian does not have these superstitious scruples, he cannot refuse to eat because of his own conscience: if he refuses to eat because of conscience, it must be another's conscience.

The explanation, therefore, "for why is my freedom condemned. . ." must be a reason for not eating. Taken so, its sense is: Don't eat, for if you do, your weaker brother will condemn you, and it is absurd that you should be condemned by the conscience of anyone else. Don't eat, and avoid being blasphemed for eating with thanksgiving.

The objection against this interpretation is that it defends the stronger Christian as if he were in some danger from the weaker Christian, whereas the main idea is consideration for the weaker Christian.

This objection is not a good one. In 8:7-13, consideration for the immature Christian is paramount, and there is indeed a slight reference to such an idea in 10:32. However, the main idea here is not consideration for the superstitious brother, but for one's own good name. Weaker brethren, today as well as in Paul's time, blaspheme or speak evil of their superiors. They slander them and injure their reputations. They would probably say, "Mr. So and So worships idols—I saw him eat an idol sacrifice."

Hence the mature Christian is indeed in danger from the ignorant Christian, and he should protect himself with the ignorant brother and thus have the opportunity, which other-

wise he would never have, of instructing him in the Pauline doctrine that there is nothing wrong in eating meat that has been offered to idols, so long as the ritual is over and the meat has been put in the butcher shop for sale.

31 "Whether then you eat or drink or whatever you do, do everything to the glory of God."

This general principle is not to be taken as directed only and specifically to the mature Christian. The weaker brother needs this admonition even more. It applies to all Christians, and it applies not merely with reference to things offered to idols, but to all conduct. On the basis of such a verse as this, the Westminster Catechism can say, "Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever."

32-33 "Be inoffensive both to Jews and Greeks and to the church of God, as I also please all men in all ways, not seeking my own advantage, but that of the many, in order that they may be saved."

Along with the preceding verse, this is the general conclusion. To be inoffensive probably means not to sin against someone, or not to cause him to sin. If so, "Jews and Greeks" would not mean "Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians" (which would make "the church of God" superfluous), but rather non-Christian Jews and non-Christian Gentiles, and *especially* the church of God.

Paul uses himself as an example: he pleases all men in everything. How false! Paul never pleased all men. He made them terribly angry, so angry that they beat him, stoned him, and put him in jail. He did not even try to please all men. Ephesians 6:6 and Colossians 3:22 condemn men-pleasers, and Paul heatedly denies the accusation in Galatians 1:10.

One must therefore limit the verb *arexkō* by the following phrase: "not seeking my own advantage but that of the many." Paul sought to serve all men in order to save some. He sought their good. This would have pleased them, had they known what their good was: eternal life through Jesus Christ, the Lord of Glory.

1 "Imitate me, as I do Christ."

This is clearly the concluding exhortation of the preceding argument. It has great homiletical possibilities; but the versifier must have been unusually distracted to make it the first verse of a new chapter.

2-16. Summary: These fifteen verses discuss the length of hair, women prophesying, and customary decency in the church. It is a difficult section. Because of the difficulties, no further summary will be given here.

2 "I praise you because you remember me in all things, and you hold the [instructions] given as I gave them to you."

This praise seems extreme, for if indeed the Corinthians remembered Paul in all matters, they did not obey him in everything. The letter, itself, shows how many faults the Corinthian church was guilty of, including attacks on Paul, himself. However, since Paul here praises them, the presupposition seems to be that however much some individuals and some small groups deviated from the paths of righteousness, nevertheless the main body was at least relatively faithful. It is a welcome balance in such a mass of reproof.

The main body, then, held on to Paul's instructions as he gave them. The noun *paradosis* (KJ, ordinances; RSV and NAS, traditions) and the verb *paredōka* have two connotations, both in classical Greek and in Koinē. Liddell and Scott give: to hand over, to transmit, betray; and for the noun: transmission, tradition, teaching, doctrine, as well as surrender. In Galatians 1:14 and Colossians 2:8, the word refers to worthless or false teachings of men. In the present verse, as also in II Thessalonians 2:15 and 3:6, the term refers to the Word of God as handed down by Paul.

That Paul's spoken word in any way deviated from his

written epistles is incredible. That it is possible in this twentieth century, or that it was possible in the sixteenth century, to discover a tradition apart from and equal in authority to the Bible is a Romish delusion. Only scriptural information is trustworthy. Paul commended the Corinthians for holding onto his teaching just as he gave it.

3 "I want you to know that Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of the woman, and that God is the head of Christ."

Before Paul even begins to describe the problem he wishes next to attack, he lays down the principle on which his admonitions will be based. The principle is that of an hierarchical order. By this is not meant a Romish hierarchy of popes, bishops, and priests, but nonetheless, there are ranks or rankings in the church, as also will be seen in 12:28 and context. The hierarchy here is God, Christ, man, and woman. God and the Messiah are equally divine, but there is a subordination of function; so too, man and woman are spiritually equal, but one ranks above the other in function. This particularly refers to life in the Church. No doubt the hierarchical order applies to the home as well as to the Church, and to the non-Christians as well as to Christians. The reference to God's creating man first (11:7-9, 12) implies the same ranking in all societies. Similarly, there is a sense, an important sense, in which Christ is the head of all things (Eph. 1:10). Nevertheless, this chapter has to do with worship and concerns Christ as the head of the Church (Col. 1:18).

4 "Every man who has something hanging down from his head while he prays or prophesies disgraces his head."

This verse does not say that the man wears a hat or a veil. Nor does it precisely say, "having something on his head" (NAS). It is definitely something *hanging down from* his head. This could be a veil or a toga. Plutarch (*Moralia* 100 F) speaks of a man who "was walking having his garment hanging down from his head," but whereas Plutarch identifies

what was hanging down, Paul does not. Most commentaries assume that a veil is meant, but could it not mean long hair hanging down?

At any rate, if a man prays or prophesies with something hanging down from his head, he dishonors Christ. The verse says that the man dishonors his head. Quite so. The previous verse had said that his head was Christ. Therefore, the wrong method of prayer dishonors Christ.

However, first, what were the ancient customs relative to prayer? Chrysostom mentions pagan prophets who prophesied with hats or coverings on their heads. Whether Jewish men of the first centuries prayed with their hats on, as they do today, is a different question. Rabbi Jehoshua (c. A.D. 90) says that men usually walked bareheaded in public, while women wore a veil or something because, he says, woman brought sin into the world. Sometimes men too would wear hats, but children hardly ever did. In Babylon, but apparently not in Palestine, a hat on a man indicated that he was married. In Palestine, a man's bare head signified political freedom from Pharaoh. Other rabbinical hints seem to imply that, therefore, a man should wear a hat to pray, for he was not free from God. Then, there are other indications that men wore hats in winter simply because it was cold and did not wear them in summer. The rabbinical passages on prayer also indicate both customs. Sometimes men prayed with a hat on, sometimes without a hat.

Now it is clear that Paul objects to something. Clearly also, he assumes that the Corinthians would instantly recognize that the posture in question was shameful. How can one explain either of these points when many of the Jewish men prayed with their hats on? However, if Paul is not referring to hats, but to long hair, neither of these two points is strange, or at least not so strange. More later.

5-6 "Every woman who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered disgraces her head. For it is one and the same as being shaved. For if the woman is not covered, let her

[hair] be cut. But if shaving or cutting is a disgrace to a woman, let her be covered."

One evening, the present writer attended a prayer meeting in a private home. The wife of the host wore a hat. This seemed strange, since she was in her own home, but then this passage came to mind and it was clear that she and her husband thought God required her to wear a hat when she prayed—at least when other church members were present—but did she wear a hat when she went to bed at night?

Therefore, we must examine these verses to determine where the praying that Paul refers to takes place. The passage hardly refers to family worship. Before her husband at home, or in ejaculatory prayer during the day, would a woman bring shame upon her head, in other words, her husband, stamping herself as a prostitute, by not wearing a veil? Paul is concerned with public censure. He had in mind offending pagans by introducing new customs.

By not wearing a covering in public, a woman disgraced her husband. The TR reads: dishonors *her own* head. This reading would also imply that the man dishonored his own head rather than Christ. However, *her own* does not have the better textual support. *Autēs* is found in A, C, D, F, G, I, and Aleph. *Heautēs* is found in B, E, K. Furthermore, *autēs*, simply *her*, gives the much better sense: she dishonors her head, in other words, her husband.

The dishonoring, of course, would be public. Where then is the place? If, now, one immediately assumes that the place is the worship service in the church, the difficulty is that women were not permitted to pray aloud in a church service, as 14:34-35 makes clear. One might counter by noting that women pray silently in church and should therefore wear hats. However, these verses also mention prophesying, and prophesying cannot be silent. Where then could women prophesy? Could it be in an evangelistic street meeting? What would the pagan in Corinth have thought of such a woman?

Philip had four daughters who prophesied (Acts 21:9).

The passage is far from clear, but one may perhaps suppose that this prophesying took place in Philip's home when other Christians had come informally to visit. At least, other prophesyings in the same chapter occurred in such circumstances (Acts 21:4, 5, 11). This, therefore, seems to be the most plausible supposition.

Let us now consider the phrase, "It is one and the same as being shaved." The NAS is apparently wrong in saying, "she is one and the same. . . ." The numeral is not feminine (*μία*), but neuter (*ἓν*). Besides, it makes better sense than *she*. *Shaved* is feminine because it refers to the feminine noun *head*.

Here, and in 11:13, where Paul speaks of the woman, the head is *uncovered*. The word is not *hanging down*. This language seems to imply a veil or cloth. The Halakha expects a Jewish woman to wear a head covering when she goes out of the house. To refuse to wear a head covering was a ground for divorce, based on Deuteronomy 24:1. Indeed, in such a case, the husband is not even required to give her a certificate of divorce. There are also references to covering the face except the eyes. One, today, thinks of veils, but the information suggests that veils were not used in Palestine but only in Arab countries. "Arab Jewesses must veil themselves when they go out on the Sabbath" because the veil is a daily custom, and "Arab women must cover their head and face, with the exception of their eyes."

Paul's meaning, therefore, is that Christian women should wear head coverings because not wearing them is the equivalent of shaving their heads, and this is shameful, as every Corinthian will acknowledge. If, then, a woman does not want her head shaved, let her put on a veil or scarf.

7 "For a man ought not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man.

Now, while it is obvious that the Corinthians took the lack of a veil to be a sign of a prostitute, and that they might

shave an adulteress' head as public censure, it is not so clear that man's being the image of God requires him to remove his hat for prayer, especially since this was not a universal Jewish custom.

Some commentators try to explain it by saying, "to cover the head is a sign of submission to human power." However, the Quakers in the 17th and 18th centuries got into trouble because they kept their hats on in the King's presence. In this case, at least, the uncovered head, not the covered head, was a sign of submission to human power. Similarly, the Spanish grandees thought it a high honor when they were granted permission to keep their hats on. Furthermore, how can one proceed from this premise, if it were granted, to the correct approach to God?

8-9 "For man did not come from woman, but woman from man. For man was not created for the woman, but woman for the man."

This verse is not a reason why a man should remove his hat while praying. It explains the last half of the preceding verse; it explains why man is the image of God and woman is the image of man. The reason goes back to creation. Not only was woman derived from man, but she was created for him and not vice versa.

Once more the solution to the problems of this age is to be found in the Old Testament. In this case, it is the order of creation that settles the question.

10 "Therefore the woman ought to have authority on her head because of angels."

This epistle is not always easy to understand, but in spite of the difficulty the verse must mean that woman's subordination to man, as asserted in the previous verse, implies a moral obligation to have something on her head as the sign of her husband's authority over her. Without such a covering, she not only dishonors her husband, but also, since the location is a Christian assembly of some sort, and the activity is praying and prophesying, she was showing despite to the at-

rendani angels. Why Paul did not mention God instead of angels is another difficulty.

11 "Except neither [is] woman without man nor man without woman by the Lord."

Really, Paul is hard to follow, isn't he? In fact, this verse is almost insurmountably difficult. Does it assert the spiritual equality of man and woman, as Galatians 3:28? The phrase "in the Lord" might indicate that such is the meaning here also. Hence some say, in a Christian marriage, both parties have the same relation to the Lord. However, the reason given in the next verse does not fit such an interpretation. In fact, it fits so poorly that perhaps the translation *in the Lord*, as found in nearly all versions (Phillips tries something different), should be changed to what is given above. The meaning will then be: by divine arrangement each spouse is dependent on the other. Because . . .

12 "Because as the woman [is, or came] from the man, so also the man by means of the woman. And all things are from God."

This is why neither man nor woman is independent and self-sufficient. The preposition *from* and the preposition *by means of* are not precisely synonymous. The *from* recalls creation, where man did not come by means of woman at all. Since creation, however, all other men have been born by a woman.

Of course, any pagan would admit that men are born of women. This fact just about renders meaningless the translation "in the Lord." The apostle is not discussing spiritual equality in a Christian marriage, but the translation *by the Lord* makes tolerable sense. The worst that can be said is that the pagan admission makes the phrase unnecessary. However, this objection would also apply to the last phrase of the present verse: "And all things come from God." Repetitious though the two phrases are, they are not improper even though the pagans admit their truth. Pagans sometimes stumble on truths, even though they cannot fit them into their

heathen systems. The Stoics believed that all things come from God. However, these propositions are part of the Christian system and can properly be asserted here: the relationship between man and woman is what it is by divine arrangement.

13-15 "Judge for yourselves: Is it proper for a woman to pray to God uncovered? Does not nature itself teach you that if a man have long hair, it is a disgrace to him? But if a woman have long hair, it is her glory because her hair is given to her instead of a veil."

A few verses back the question was asked, but not answered, what proof is there that a man is under moral obligation to remove his hat when he prays or prophesies? Here, the similar question is, Why should a woman be required to wear a hat or a veil?

Well, first of all, there is no need to discuss hats and veils. Although the eastern custom was veils or mantles for women, and although some words in the last ten verses seem to refer to such coverings, it now becomes evident that hair, not hats, is the important matter. God has given women long hair instead of veils. This fits in well with the phrase in 11:4, "something hanging down from the head." It also allows a fairly good sense to the question, "Does not nature itself teach you. . . ." Surely nature does not teach that women must wear hats in order to pray, but nature does teach that a woman's hair is normally longer than a man's.

Some difficulty still remains. It is hard to see how nature, either the laws of physics and zoology, or the so-called "second" nature of habit and custom, can be the basis for deriving the proper mode of worshipping God. Are not all regulations for worship given, explicitly or by implication, in Scripture? Do we sing, pray, and preach because nature so teaches, or because God so commands?

If a man has long hair, he disgraces himself. The passage certainly discourages hippy hair, but does nature, itself, so teach? If an unstable liberal lets his hair grow to a dirty

length because he is envious of the establishment, still his hair is a natural growth, no matter how it offends good manners. Is it a sin to eat potatoes with a knife? Does nature teach a Moslem not to eat with his left hand? Or is it not plainly true that empirical observation cannot justify any moral norm?

16. "But if anyone seems contentious, we do not have such a custom, nor do the churches of God."

Possibly, this verse is the solution to most of the difficulties. However, the solution will appear only after further difficulties in this verse are resolved. There are two: (1) the translation of *toioutên*, here rendered *such* and by other translators *other*; (2) the identification of the *custom*. A proper translation should depend on the ordinary rules of the Greek language, but sometimes the identification of the custom or a prejudgment as to what Paul ought to have said inclines some translators to violate the Greek language.

A normal person would think that the custom, the only custom referred to in the chapter, is the custom of men cutting their hair and women wearing it long, but strangely, some commentators assert that Paul means the "custom" of being contentious.

F. W. Grosheide (p. 261) says, "The apostle did not approve of what happened when women prayed or prophesied. Assuming or knowing that the conduct of these women is ardently defended, the apostle states that he does not agree and that it is not his (*we*) custom nor that of the churches of God to be contentious."

Grosheide does not quite agree with this. He prefers a modification, and continues: "Another interpretation is that, although there be many in the world who are contentious, he and his helpers are not thus characterized. . . . Paul does not add contentiously; the point at issue is the only thing that matters. And because that point is so important the apostle may not give in, even though he may appear thus to be contentious. This interpretation is the better of the two."

This makes the *verse* a contrast between contentious

people in the world (not in the church) and Paul's apparent contentiousness. Surely this is far-fetched.

Dr. Leon Morris also has something noteworthy. He correctly translates the Greek, but not all of his interpretation can be accepted. He writes, "*We have no such custom, i.e. such as women praying or prophesying with head uncovered. . . .*"

This is a complete reversal of the context. The custom which the chapter has discussed is *women praying covered*. Dr. Morris says that the custom is *women praying uncovered*. It is obvious that Dr. Morris wishes to accommodate his correct knowledge of Greek to what he believes Paul ought to have said.

Furthermore, Dr. Morris adds that Paul's inspired application of the principle of modesty does not apply today: "We may well hold that the fullest acceptance of the principle underlying this chapter does not require that in western lands in the twentieth century women must always wear hats to pray." Here, again, it seems that Dr. Morris wishes to accommodate what he thinks Paul means to what is regarded as acceptable manners today. Note that if Paul did not mean what this interpretation attributes to him, neither of these two accommodations are needed.

As for the new versions that have appeared since World War II, they all mistranslate *toioutên* and make Paul say the exact opposite of what he wrote. The RSV, the NEB, the NAS, the NAB (Roman Catholic) all translate *toioutên* as "other" instead of "such." Their wording and meaning are essentially: If anyone is inclined to be contentious, there is no use arguing with him, we simply squelch him by our authority and say, We have no other practice, nor have the churches of God.

However, this is precisely the opposite of what Paul says. If someone asks me, does your family always eat turkey on Thanksgiving?—and if I answer, we have no *other* custom; it means that we eat turkey. However, if I reply, we have no *such* custom, it means that we do not eat turkey.

Of English versions, only the KJ and the ARV of 1901 translate the Greek correctly. The others are plainly wrong. *Hemeis toiautēn sunētheian ouk echomen* can mean only "We have no such custom." Foreign versions maintain the better scholarship of the KJ and the ARV. The standard German translation (Lutherisches Verlagshaus, Berlin, 1968) reads, "Ist aber jemand unter euch, der Lust hat, darüber zu zanken, der wisse, dass wir *solchen* Brauch nicht haben. . . ." Osterwald's French version is, "Que s'il y a quelqu'un qui se plaise à contester, nous n'avons pas *cette* coutume. . . ." The French and German versions, like the KJ, are correct.

The mistranslations apparently depend on the fact that prejudgments of what Paul ought to have said resulted in altering what he actually did say. In reading verses 4-15, nearly everyone expects Paul to say, we have no other custom. The eastern customs of the first century surely required women to have long hair, or wear a veil. Then could Paul have said, the Christian churches have no such custom? Is Paul asserting that Christianity has done away with the common custom, or is he upholding it? However puzzling the difficulty is, one thing is undeniable: *toiautēn* means *such*, not *other*, and it should be correctly translated, no matter what difficulties it produces in exegesis.

The difficulties, both in this verse and in the earlier verses, are dissipated if we take Paul's words as they are. Hats and veils are not in question. The subject is hair, and the Christian Church doesn't care how anyone wears his or her hair. The long-haired hippy may show bad taste and be offensive to more polite people, but if he has just been converted, we will admit him to the Lord's Supper immediately, and let the length of hair await his becoming civilized.

17-34 Summary: The Corinthians have desecrated the Lord's Supper. Not only must it be celebrated soberly, but the communicants must understand its significance. Otherwise, a man will be guilty of the Lord's blood and bring condemnation upon himself.

17 "In giving this instruction, I do not praise [the fact] that you come together, not for the better, but for the worse."

The RSV has, "But in the following instructions, I do not commend you, because when you come together it is not for the better, but for the worse."

If a person reads along normally and does not have in mind what Paul will say in 11:20 ff., he will no doubt think that Paul refrains from commending them in the previous, not the following, instructions. This impression is strengthened by the next two verses, which refer to points of complaint made in the early chapters of the epistle. Then, too, the verb *praise* (*epainō*) seems to echo the same word in 11:2. Hence, although 11:20 begins a new subject, an additional disorder in the Corinthian church, the present verse is better taken as referring backward rather than forward.

18 "For first, when you assemble in church, I hear that there are schisms among you, and I partly believe it."

There are two difficulties in this verse. The first is the word *first*. Since it points to an enumeration, one naturally looks for the *second*. It could be that *schisms* are first and disorders at the Lord's Supper are second. In fact, there is nothing else in the chapter out of which to make a second point. Possibly Paul omits the word *second* and minimizes the idea of an enumeration because the disorders at the Lord's Supper are a particular example of the schisms. Of course, one could possibly maintain that the subject matter of chapter 12 is the second point.

The other difficulty in 11:18 is the phrase, "I partly believe it." From the early chapters, it is evident that Paul more than "partly" believed it. He was completely convinced and censured them for it. The usual explanation is that Paul now refers to cliques that form during the celebration of a meal ending in the Lord's Supper. In view of the serious divisions discussed before, it is not surprising that cliques should have appeared at a church supper.

19 "For there must be heresies among you in order that those approved may become evident among you."

There must be heresies. The reason that heresies occur by necessity and not by chance is that God decreed them. One should not stumble at the thought that God decrees evil: God decreed that Judas should betray Christ, and Christ selected him as a disciple for that purpose. The action of Judas was of course a sin, an exceedingly great sin, but without that sin there could have been no atonement. Now, here, the purpose of heresies is not to make the Atonement possible, but to make evident those theologians whom God approves. In times of great controversies and heresies, God shows his approval of men like Athanasius and Augustine. It was thus, too, that Luther was recognized. People who do not actively combat heresy, whether because they are intellectually incapable or because they are cowardly, may indeed be Christians, but they lack God's evident approval.

20 "Accordingly, when you assemble in the same place, it is not [possible] to eat the Lord's Supper."

Someone might wish to insist that *kuriakan deiphon* means a love feast rather than the Lord's Supper technically speaking, but however impolite greediness might be at a church supper, the important point and the one particularly discussed in the next few verses, is the sacrament of the Lord's Supper that followed the *Agape*.

The translation above inserted the word *possible* in brackets. Since *estin* can grammatically mean "it is possible," the brackets are perhaps not really necessary; and it makes good sense to say that for the Corinthians to celebrate the Lord's Supper in such a frame of mind was morally impossible. The brackets were put in, however, because another translation is also grammatically correct. One might say, "when you assemble, it is not [for the real purpose] of eating the Lord's Supper [though it may be your professed purpose]." The present exegete opines that the former translation and interpretation are better.

21-22 "For each of you in eating takes his own supper [first], and one is hungry and another drunk. Do you not have houses in which to eat and drink? Or do you despise the Church of God and put to shame those who have nothing? What shall I say to you? Shall I praise you? In this I do not praise [you]."

Arndt and Gingrich cite 11:21 as a verse in which the *pro* of *prolambanei* has lost its sense of *before*. This reduces the meaning to "each eats his own supper." So taken, the verse identifies the disgraceful conduct, not so much as eating ahead of the designated hour, as a refusal to share one's more abundant meal with the poorer Christians in the place. This is a sufficient cause for Paul's displeasure. However, if the *pro* retains any of its original force, indicated by the word *first* in brackets, the disgrace is not merely a refusal to share, but in addition, a greediness to eat one's more abundant meal first, before the others can get started on theirs, and thus perhaps create a situation where nothing is left to share. The greater rather than the lesser degree of disorder is twice hinted at in the following words. First, there is the reference to drunkenness. This goes beyond the impoliteness of not waiting for all to commence eating at the same time. Then, second, the tone of 11:22 favors the idea of greater disorder.

The whole is a reason why it was impossible for these people to celebrate the Lord's Supper. They did indeed intend to, but selfishness like this, drunkenness, and a generally contemptuous attitude toward the other Christians divested the ceremony of any positive spiritual value. Perhaps no doubt an exceptional individual may properly and reverently have done "this in remembrance of me." However, on the whole, the desecrated ceremony could only produce the negative spiritual values that are about to be explained.

23-24 "For I received from the Lord the [information] which I also gave you, viz., that the Lord on the night in which he was betrayed took bread and having given thanks broke it and said, This is my body which is [broken?] for you. Do this to remember me."

Before considering the main thought of this verse and the following, let us notice two small points. The phrase "on the night in which . . ." is *en tēi nukti hēi*. The preposition is *en*. Contrary to the views of A. T. Robertson and any Baptist who follows him, here is an instance of the preposition *en* that cannot be locative. Night is not a place; it is a time; and hence *en* here is temporal, not spatial.

A second minor matter, but one that attracts attention because of the use of these words in our communion services, is the presence or absence of the word *broken*. KJ has it; the others omit it and put it in a margin. Papyrus 46, Aleph, A, B, C do not have it. A third hand correction of Aleph, a few poorer uncials, and many cursives have *klēmenon*, broken. It is almost impossible to resist the combined evidence against the word. This in no way alters the biblical view of Christ's bodily sacrifice or of the communion service, for the idea of the broken body and the broken bread are found in 10:16 and the present verse, itself.

A more important idea in this verse is Paul's assertion that Jesus, Himself, gave him the information and that it is this very same information that Paul has given the Corinthians. Remember also Paul's denial in Galatians 1:1 that his apostleship depended on an election by men, as Matthias' did, but that he was appointed by Christ; and Galatians 1:17 and 2:6 go further and deny that the original apostles added anything to the Gospel Paul had already been preaching for more than fifteen years.

We are not to suppose that Jesus gave Paul all this theology in the few minutes that elapsed on the road to Damascus. More likely Christ revealed it to him during his three-year "seminary course" in Arabia. This is what made Paul a *prophet*. Ministers today are not prophets. No one today prophesies. A prophet is one who receives a verbal revelation directly from God. Such revelations ceased with the death of John (if he was the last apostle to die).

Note, too, that a revelation is not always a general or

universal proposition, such as the doctrine of justification by faith. God also reveals particular or individual propositions, such as the occurrence of events. Christ told Paul that He, Jesus, had given thanks, had broken some bread, and had given it to His disciples. Of course, the revelation also included the general or universal proposition that "this is my body." The explanation accompanies the event. However, revelation contains information that events have taken place, as well as why they took place. In this case, the event occurred for the purpose of keeping alive the remembrance of Christ's crucifixion.

25 "Similarly also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, to remember me."

This commentary is not the place for a full discussion of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper; but a few points directly related to the immediate wording are not amiss.

In 11:24-25, we have the words, "this is (*estis*) my body" and "this cup is (*estis*) the new covenant." Surely from these words no one can deduce the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation, nor its Lutheran alternate. In a Lutheran church, two or three young people were standing on the rostrum; the pastor was catechizing them before the assembled congregation in preparation for receiving them into communicant membership. Quoting probably from the Gospels, he said, "This is my body." Then he asked—though the procedure became more rhetorical than catechetical—"What does it mean? Is means is!" The timid young girls nodded their assent. One is reminded of Luther's expedient of writing in chalk on the table as he sat down with Zwingli, "Hoc est meum corpus." Luther was taking no chances that he would forget the "real presence" as he talked with the older Swiss Reformer. Is means is!

Now it might seem like treason for a Christian to remind Luther that the pagan Aristotle listed ten different meanings for the verb *to be*, but it is not treason to point out that

11:25 says, "This cup is the new covenant. . . ." However, a silver chalice cannot literally be a covenant. Against this indubitable truth the embarrassed sacramentarian might wish to remark that the next words are, "in my blood." However, again, blood cannot literally be a covenant. Anyway, the verse says that the cup, not the blood, is the covenant. If one wishes to be crabbedly literal and insist that "'is' is simply 'is,'" he must also take the cup literally.

The Bible, however, uses natural language, not an artificial language imagined by incompetent scholarship; and natural language is not always literal. Revelation 1:20 says, "The seven lamps are (*ēisin*, the same verb to be) the seven churches." How can any theologian be so perverse to insist that seven lamps seen in a vision literally are seven churches in Asia Minor? Let us speak natural English, or at least Greek.

Another point directly made in the very wording, though not so important as the preceding, is the information that the Lord's Supper was instituted after the feast. The Roman church superstitiously forbids its people to take the glucose wafer after a meal. It must be swallowed (one hardly eats a glucose wafer) on an empty stomach.

Now, one does not have to insist that the Church must serve an evening meal in order to hold a communion service a few minutes later. Since the Lord's Supper replaces the Passover, that part of the disciples' procedure need not—as Passover, should not—be repeated. Nor does one have to insist that the celebration take place in the evening rather than in the morning. The New Testament does not specify the hour of day at which our services must be held. Nor, again, can we insist that a person eat a good meal at home before coming to the sacrament. However, we can insist that no church has the authority to prohibit a person from eating all he wants to, immediately before coming to the table of the Lord. In doing so, Romanism condemns the disciples—and the Lord Himself—and imposes a man-made superstition on its people.

26 "For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he come."

The preceding words were the words of Jesus, Himself, but this verse is Paul's words. It states a reason for celebrating the sacrament. The idea that this service is to continue throughout the present age, and the idea that the minister proclaims the Gospel as he explains the service, as well as the fact that the communicants, too, in a way proclaim the death of Christ by their participation, are important enough ideas; but they are so clear that a commentary hardly needs to give them much explanation.

27 "Consequently he who eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord."

It might have been mentioned in connection with the preceding verses, but here, again, both the body and the blood are specified. The Corinthian congregation both ate the bread and drank the wine. The Bible gives no justification for, and by implication condemns, the Romish deformation of the sacrament by not serving the wine to the people. The fact that the Corinthians profaned the sacrament is no excuse for not celebrating it as the Bible requires. Nor is there any other excuse.

This verse, of course, centers not on the deformation, but on the profanation. It is a conclusion from the previous premises. Since the sacrament is such as has been described, instituted by Christ, Himself, in the manner stated, Christians should not engage in it unworthily. Two points need some explanation: (1) what constitutes a worthy participation, and (2) what precisely is the meaning of being guilty of the body and blood of the Lord?

To take the second question first, one may begin with an inference drawn by Lutherans, which essentially is: the object against which we sin must be present, and since we sin against the body and blood of Christ, the literal body and blood must be present in the elements. However, the argu-

ment contains a false premise. It is not necessary that the object sinned against be physically present. The left wing radicals who visited Hanoi and desecrated the American flag while there, encouraging the communists to increase the torture of captured soldiers, sinned against the United States, but the United States was not physically and locally present in Hanoi. The flag, the symbol of the United States, was present.

Further, concerning guilt, someone has suggested that people who desecrate the sacrament, had they been present in Jerusalem on the fourteenth of Nisan, would have cooperated in crucifying Christ. This, of course, cannot be substantiated and is probably false. Inconsistent human nature sins readily in one direction, while at the same time it holds a different sin in abhorrence. Then, too, there is a sense in which every sin, even the least, makes a person guilty of putting Christ to death, for "every sin deserves God's wrath and curse; both in this life and that which is to come" (S. C. 84). However, there can be greater temporal punishments for some sins than for others; and desecration of the sacrament incurs such, as will be seen further on.

28-29 "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup; for he who eats and drinks, eats and drinks judgment on himself, if he does not distinguish the body."

Before participating in the communion service, a person must determine that he has a sufficiently correct understanding of its significance. Perhaps the congregational organization should also take some steps to prevent the thoughtless and profane from participating. However, here, Paul laid the obligation on each individual person. How much understanding a person should have is not spelled out, presumably because there are different degrees of intellectual capability and of Christian maturity. However, even the least instructed must know that the bread is no longer ordinary bread, but has been set apart by prayer and made a symbol of the crucifixion.

Some commentators, and presumably the KJ, RSV, and NAS do not care to translate the last phrase as "if he does not *distinguish*" between common bread and the sacramental symbol. They argue that *diakrinō* is used again twice in 11:31; the same root, though with a different prefix, occurs twice in 11:32; and the cognate noun in 11:34. In these cases, the English word *distinguish* is inappropriate, and therefore *judge* should be the translation in all these cases.

In reply, one can say that the situation in Corinth, where the people turned the Lord's Supper into a disorderly feast, is better taken care of by *distinguish* rather than *judge*. Christians certainly do not sit in judgment on the body of the Lord, as we do on ourselves in the following verses. Therefore, even if the verb were translated *judge*, in accordance with its root meaning, it would have to be interpreted in the sense that the Corinthians ought to *judge that* the bread symbolized the body. They could not judge the body. They should have distinguished it. Their fault consisted in not seeing the body in the bread.

This reply is strengthened by the fact that judging and distinguishing are closely related. The latter is one type of the former, but the former can also mean *condemn*, while this idea is absent from, is not explicitly included in, is not necessary to, the latter. Everyday English uses words in the same way; and the connotative difference in the use of the same word enhances the literary effect. Here, for a translation, "judge the body" makes poor sense, while "distinguish the body" makes good sense.

30 "For this reason many among you are weak and sick and a large number have died."

Verses 27 and 29 both indicate the serious guilt and liability to penalty involved in the unworthy participation in the Lord's Supper. Here, the penalties are specifically mentioned. They are similar to the "delivering over to Satan" that Paul inflicted in 5:5. They are weakness and illness and even death. Nor is death too infrequent a penalty, for Paul

says that *hikanoi*, a sufficient number, a good many, have died for this reason. Clearly, this is a serious matter. I wonder how many cases of gall stones, diabetes, and heart attacks today are the result of the profanation of the sacrament?

31-32 "If we were [or, had been habitually] judging ourselves, we should not be judged; but being judged by the Lord we are instructed in order that we may not be condemned with the world."

The Corinthians could have escaped the weaknesses, illnesses, and death of the previous verse, if they had engaged in some self-examination. Serious as the matter is, and without in the least implying that one may after all neglect this duty, Paul points out that not all is lost. The judgments of the Lord, these illnesses and deaths, instruct us. The verb connotes fathers' bringing up or educating their children. Sometimes, fatherly instruction takes the form of chastisement, but the purpose is our good. God inflicts penalties upon us in order that we may escape the utter destruction that He will inflict on the world.

33-34 "Consequently, my brethren, when you assemble to eat, wait for one another. If anyone is hungry, let him eat at home, in order that you may not be assembled to condemnation. The other matters I shall set in order when I come."

This is the general conclusion of the section. The only difficulty here is the assumption that there will be a regular meal at which the early comers are to wait so that all may sit down together, coupled with the seemingly conflicting statement that if anyone is hungry, he should eat at home. Well, sometimes I have eaten at home, knowing that the church supper would never start on time. Was there, then, or was there not a feast in Corinth? Perhaps the verses indicate that Paul expected the Agape to continue as a custom for a while and then die out, leaving the communion service in isolation as it now is. Certainly the Lord's Supper is commanded, and the love feast is not. The statement is also made that Paul will use his apostolic authority to set other matters straight when he next visits them.

12

1-11 Summary: The one Spirit and the one Lord give the members of the Church a variety of gifts, ministries, and activities. Each gift is for the good of the Church as a whole, whether it be wisdom, knowledge, faith, or foreign languages. The Spirit assigns these gifts to various individuals as He pleases.

1-3 "Now concerning spiritual [gifts], brethren, I do not want you to be ignorant. You know that when you were Gentiles [heathen] with your speechless idols, how, being led, you were led [hither and yon]. Therefore I inform you that no one speaking by the Spirit of God says, Cursed be Jesus; and no one can say, Lord Jesus, unless by the Holy Spirit."

Very likely, the Corinthians had also informed Paul about their difficulties with spiritual gifts; or perhaps they had enquired only about tongues and Paul replied more generally; for chapter 12 is not particularly about tongues. The subject is spiritual gifts in general. Some commentators take *tôn pneumatikôn* as masculine, instead of neuter, and translate it as, "Concerning inspired men." Now, indeed, 12:2-3 speak of persons, and at any rate, there can be no gifts without persons to receive them; yet to take *pneumatikôn* as masculine and rule out the neuter altogether faces two difficulties. First, since some spiritual men have none of the gifts mentioned, the announced topic would be broader than the matter discussed. Second, though doubtless it is almost the same point, the chapter discusses gifts, not people.

The Greek TR and the English KJ, in the second verse, omit the *when*. This omission makes good sense: "Ye know that ye were carried away unto these dumb idols, even as ye were led." The word *when* complicates the sentence; but the

MS evidence for *when* includes Aleph, A, B, C, D, E, and L. This combination is almost irresistible, and we must accept the grammatical complications. See the translation above.

Although the chapter does not mainly concern speaking in tongues, the discussion of which comes two chapters later, an anticipation of this subject, mentioned indeed in 12:10, may be seen in Paul's characterization of the idols as being without speech. The idols, therefore, either the physical statues or the represented Zeus and others, could not direct the heathen worshippers. The worshippers were led, in belief and action, hither and yon, either by priests, or perhaps in Paul's mind, by demons.

However, the God of the Christians speaks, and Paul will now give His directions concerning the purposes and use of His gifts.

As prophesied in the Old Testament, the apostolic age was to witness a proliferation of spiritual gifts. No wonder the Corinthians were puzzled and no wonder some responded in unfortunate ways. There was need for instruction.

The first instruction is that no one who says Jesus is accursed can be inspired of the Spirit. For the last fifteen hundred years, until the rise of Marxism, hardly anyone called Jesus accursed. Even violently anti-Christians, like Spinoza and Renan, did not attack Jesus personally. Even Edwin A. Burt only goes so far as to call Jesus stupid and immoral (*Types of Religious Philosophy*, 2nd ed., pp. 335 ff.); and this is less than calling him accursed, for he also says, "Jesus was a man of remarkable human sympathy . . . his teaching [contains] the best moral insights and social attitudes preached by his predecessors." At least if this is damning, it is anathematizing by faint praise. Were there then in Paul's day any who explicitly anathematized Jesus? There may have been occasional pagans who cursed Jesus, but more

View Page 20 Paul had in mind the violent Pharisaic reaction to the . . . Note that Paul does not refer to calling *Christ* accursed. Pharisees would not curse Messiah. They called Jesus accursed.

Yet it is somewhat of a puzzle why Paul gave this rather obvious information to the Corinthian Christians. Even the most inconsistent of them could hardly have thought that a denunciation of Jesus was the result of divine inspiration.

The negative is completed into an entirely general principle by the positive criterion, "No one can say Lord Jesus except by the Holy Ghost." (Perhaps the negative part preceded for the definite purpose of having a completely general statement.) *Kurios* is the Greek LXX translation of the Hebrew JHVH (Jehovah). "Jesus is Lord" therefore means that the baby who was born of the virgin Mary is the Jehovah of the Old Testament. Romans 10:9 says, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Lord Jesus and believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."

Two remarks should be made. First, it is explicit in Romans 10:9 and implicit in 12:3 that confession and belief are necessary—not just pronouncing the words. Jesus warned that at the judgment He would reject many people who had said, "Lord, Lord." These people either did not know the significance of the words or they were hypocrites by reason of unbelief. To avoid God's condemnation, one must both understand the intellectual content of the words and sincerely believe it. Now, second, when Paul asserts that no one can say Lord Jesus except by the Holy Ghost, he does not mean that everyone who so says is a prophet and has received a divine revelation. That is, such a person is not necessarily "inspired." The apostles, like the Old Testament prophets, received verbal messages from God; these other people were enlightened by the Spirit to understand and believe the messages. Thus, if an ordinary church member, with no unusual gifts, says, "Jesus is Jehovah," and if he understands the intellectual meaning, and if he is sincere, that man has been enlightened by the Holy Ghost. If now someone wishes to deal in anathemas and cursing, let him say, "If anyone preach contrary to what you received, let him be anathema" (Gal. 1:10).

4-6 "There are apportionments of gifts, but the same Spirit; and apportionments of ministries, and the same Lord; and apportionments of activities, but the same God who works all things in all [Christians]."

The RSV mistranslates verses 6 and 11. For an explanation, see the Excursus on the RSV inserted in chapter fifteen.

Some people, even devout Christians, think that God is very democratic and treats, or should treat, everybody alike, for "God is no respecter of persons." On the contrary, if God is no respecter of persons, He will treat each one as He pleases. Thus, these verses say three times over that God does not treat everybody alike. After all, He did not create a world of all elephants or all algae: there are birds and mountains, stars and men. The members of the human race also differ in many respects.

Ministries and activities may be thought of as subdivisions of the general class of gifts, since God assigns or gives such and such ministry to each person. Yet gifts may be restricted to those mentioned below in 12:8-9, and what is mentioned in 12:10 would be activities; though this explanation leaves no place for specific identification of ministries. It is best to suppose that the three-fold division in 12:4-6 is not a logical division into water-tight compartments, but simply a general description in aggregate. The main point is that there is one God, Father, Son, and Spirit, who gives various kinds of gifts.

In addition to the reference to the Trinity, these verses show that God works all things in all people. This may be taken so generally as to mean that God assigns ministries and activities to the unregenerate as well as to the regenerate. He assigned the ministry and activity of governor to Pontius Pilate. However, since the context concerns Christians, it is more likely that the verse says that God works all things Christians do. This would confirm Philippians 2:13, "It is God who works in you, both to will and to do, for the sake of his [own] good pleasure." Since *panta* (all people) can plausibly be restricted to all Christians, one wonders if *ta*

panta (all things) can be restricted to the gifts mentioned below. This is unlikely, first, because Philippians 2:13 gives reason for extending it to all human functions, and second, because the gifts seem to be examples subsumed under "all things." The idea therefore is that God causes—the verb is *works*, not *gives*—every Christian to do whatever he does.

7 "To each the manifestation of the Spirit is given for advantage."

KJ makes it sound as if the gifts were given for the advantage of the recipient. Of course, they were; but the following context indicates that they were given for the advantage of the church as a whole. Nevertheless, the RSV and NAS interpret rather than translate when they say, "for the common good." Note again, that these qualities and activities are not the result of human volition; they are *given* by God. This expands the thought of 4:7, "What do you have that you did not receive? Now, if you received it, why do you boast as if you had not received it?" This is a point needing special emphasis in this era when nearly all American "evangelicals" hold the Arminian theory of free-will.

8-11 "For to one through the Spirit is given the doctrine of wisdom, to another the doctrine of knowledge according to the same Spirit, to another faith by the same Spirit, to another gifts of healing by the one Spirit, to another workings of powers, to another prophecy, to another distinguishing spirits, to another kinds of languages, and all these the one and the same Spirit produces, assigning to each individual as he wishes."

Several commentators have tried to find here a three-fold division of gifts; for example, intellectual gifts (wisdom and knowledge), faith gifts (faith itself, healings, and miracles), languages (speaking and interpreting). However, there are difficulties both with this division and with the apostle's list, itself. The division is arbitrary because faith in the second subdivision and interpretation in the third are both forms of wisdom and knowledge. The list, itself, is difficult because

faith is included in one place and seems to be excluded in another. If God gives the gift of healing to some, but not to all, it would seem that there are some Christians to whom God does not give the gift of faith. Of course, God gives faith to all, for otherwise the person would not be a Christian. Hence, the enumeration must be taken as a random enumeration, simply as examples, and not as a logical division. The aim of the passage is to show that God does not treat everybody alike. That point is quite clear.

The relation between wisdom and knowledge was discussed, perhaps not thoroughly enough, in the excursus at the end of chapter three. Healings and miracles (workings of powers) hardly need comment. Prophecy is exemplified in the apostles themselves and the daughters of Philip. Distinguishing of spirits probably refers to the ability of recognizing heretical preaching (cf. 1 John 4:1). If so, this is a special case of wisdom or knowledge. Speaking in foreign languages, without having studied them, is exemplified in Acts 2:4-11. This reference could introduce the subject of modern Pentecostalism; but as the matter is more fully taken up two chapters later, nothing will be said here.

To come to the last phrase in the verse, the subject of "he wishes" is the Spirit, not the recipient. All these gifts depend on the initiative of the Spirit. He and no man decides what functions a Christian shall exercise. The Spirit distributes His gifts as He wishes. No man can do miracles just because he wants to. No man can get knowledge and wisdom by his own efforts. No one can prophesy unless the Spirit gives him a verbal message, and no one can have faith by any alleged act of free will. Faith is a gift of God, and He gives it to whomsoever He pleases.

12:31 Summary: An analogy between the human body and the body of Christ illustrates how various members and functions can be united. The Corinthian Christians are all members of Christ's body, and as in the case of eye, ear, foot, and hand, every member is of use to the whole and none

should be despised. God sets the various members in their places as it pleases Him. Even the indecent members have vital functions. No one receives all of God's gifts; only some are apostles, only some are teachers, only some speak in foreign languages. Yet it is right to desire the best gifts.

12 "For as the body is one and has many parts, and all the parts of the body, though many, are one body, so also Christ."

The idea is perfectly clear. One wonders, however, about the mentality of the Corinthians. Did they really believe that God could not give different people different gifts? Is it likely that they denied the divine source of these particular gifts? The more plausible supposition is that they failed to see that all were necessary to the unity of the Church. Surely the church at Corinth had its defects.

13 "For also by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether slaves or freemen, and all of us were made to drink one Spirit."

The reference to Jews and Greeks hints that some Jews thought the Gentiles were not necessary to the Church, or that some Gentiles thought the Jews were inferior members. Paul reminds them that the Holy Spirit had baptized all of them into one body. This was His work; it was not theirs, and they could not negate it. They were all made to drink of one Spirit, a peculiar expression, but one nevertheless that shows they did not apply for a drink of their own free will, but were made to drink the one Spirit. This is the way God constituted the church and the Corinthians had no warrant to exclude any member or despise any gift.

One other point can stand emphasis here because it is still a matter of controversy, though not exactly on the same plane as in antiquity. The point is that the unity of the Church includes the unity of converted Jews and converted Gentiles.

Modern dispensationalism makes a sharp distinction between Jews and Gentiles, and denies the unity of the people

of God between Moses and Christ with the people of God from the time of Christ to the present. In other words, the Church began, not with the repentance of Adam; but with the resurrection of Christ.

One thing that dispensationalists assert is very true: namely, that God's decree includes a glorious future for the main body of Jews, though presently unconverted. Romans 11 says clearly that the Jewish branch of the olive tree was broken off in order to graft the Gentiles into that tree; and that in the future, the natural branches of the olive tree will be grafted into that same tree again, with the result that all Israel shall be saved.

However, what the dispensationalists fail to notice is that the Gentiles were grafted into the very tree that bore the Jews. Now these verses about the branches and olive trees are figures of speech. A more literal explanation is found in Ephesians 2 and 3. In times past, the Gentiles were aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers to the Jewish covenants, but Christ broke down the wall of separation and brought the Gentiles, who had been afar off from the Jewish commonwealth, into that commonwealth. This event was not fully revealed in the Old Testament, though the promise to Abraham included the Gentiles, but the events and revelations of the apostolic age have made it quite clear. Hence the Church in the wilderness (Acts 7:38), the Church in Corinth, the commonwealth of Israel, and the Israel of God (Gal. 6:16) are one Church, the body of Christ.

14 "For also the body is not one member, but many."

The words "for also" (*kai gar*) in these two successive verses, indicate the heaping up of two additional arguments upon the "For as" (*kathaper gar*) of 12:12. Before the section is over, the series of subsidiary arguments will have become, one might say, almost top-heavy.

15-16 "If the foot should say, because I am not the hand, I am not of the body, this does not prove it is not of the body. And if the ear should say, because I am not the

eye, I am not of the body, this does not prove it is not of the body."

There is something peculiar here. If in Corinth one person despised another and considered him unimportant to the church, we would expect Paul to say, "If the foot should say to the hand, you are not a foot and hence not a part of the body. . . ." This wording emphasizes the contempt one person has for another. However, Paul's actual wording suggests that one member thought that he, himself, was not a member because he was not somebody else. This would be an excess of humility rather than contempt. The general tone of the epistle, however, does not sound as if the Corinthians were overly humble.

17-19 "If the whole body were eye, where would be hearing? If the whole were hearing, where would be smelling? But now God has placed the members, each one of them, in the body as he wished. But if they all were one member, where would be the body?"

The analogy of the Church with the human body makes an egalitarian denial of differences ridiculous. A homogeneous, undifferentiated mass could not be an organization. The Church is organized, with degrees in rank and variations in functions.

Again, as in 12:11, Paul teaches that every Christian's position in the Church is what it is because God arranged or decreed it that way. God chose which persons in the population of the world were to be put into the Church and what functions they should have. Only an immature Christian with a deplorable minimum of biblical knowledge could suppose that the nature and activities of the Church spring from man's independent will. "Whatsoever the Lord pleased, that did he in heaven and in earth" (Ps. 135:6), including the Church. Can anyone suppose that God does not determine and control "the body of Christ"?

20 "But now the members are many, but the body is one."

This verse may be taken as a conclusion to the preceding, or as an introduction to the remainder of the chapter, or as a sustaining note in a continuing crescendo.

21 "The eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of you; nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you."

Above, it was said that Paul had not pictured the Corinthians as particularly humble. On the contrary, they were proud and arrogant. Therefore, 12:14 ff. was puzzling. Nevertheless, even in an arrogant majority there might have been, even plausibly were, a few dispirited, dejected souls. If the preceding is directed to the dejected, now come the words addressed to the arrogant. As the depressed are not to doubt their inclusion in the body, the proud are not to deny them their place or consider them useless. They are necessary.

22-23 "But rather the members of the body that seem to be weaker are necessary; and what we consider to be less honorable [members] and our indecent [members] have more abundant decency, but our decent [members] do not need [it]."

What the weaker but necessary parts of the body are have been variously identified as the brain and central organs, the eyes and ears, and even the hands. The less honorable parts have been identified, by imaginative commentators, as the feet and the intestines. The only certain identification of what Paul meant is that the indecent parts are the organs of sex and excrement. When the text says that the indecent members have more abundant decency, it probably means that we take especial care to clothe them. They are decently covered. The decent members, the face or arms for example, do not have to be clothed.

No one can deny that all the organs mentioned by commentators are necessary either to the well-being of the body or to its very existence. Hence, since the human body and the body of Christ are analogous in this respect, the less distinguished members of the Church are not to be despised.

24b-25 "But God has composed the body, giving more

abundant honor to the inferior [member] in order that there be no division in the body, but that the members have the same concern for one another."

It is a matter of choice or taste whether or not to break 12:24 in half and consider the second half as the beginning of a new paragraph. The break is indeed slight, but nonetheless there seems to be a step forward.

Just how God has given more abundant honor to the less honorable parts of the body is not too clear. Perhaps this is said because these parts are more vital than the hand or even the eye.

The application of the illustration to the members of the Church—that they have the same concern or even anxiety for one another—is emphasized by a peculiar irregularity in the Greek grammar. Ordinarily, neuter plural subjects take verbs in the singular. Here the verb, after the neuter plural *μέλη* (parts) is plural. This peculiar grammar seems to carry a distributive connotation: each and every member without exception. Of course, a singular verb would have meant the same thing, but the plural makes it more pointed.

26 "And whether one member suffers, all the members suffer with [it]; [or] whether one member is honored, all the members rejoice with [it]."

The irregular grammar of the preceding verse receives a heightening by a return to the regular singular verbs in "suffer with" and "rejoice with." This heightening is a good touch because while everybody recognizes the truth of 12:26 in relation to the human body, the Corinthians have not been the only ones unaware of its truth in the churches.

27 "You are Christ's body and members of a part."

If anyone is displeased with beginning a paragraph at 12:24b, this verse can be taken as the start of the final application of the analogy to the Church. The phrase "members of a part" is puzzling. The general meaning of the verse can hardly be in doubt, but as commentaries are supposed to explain difficulties, they may be expected to explain less serious as

well as more serious difficulties. The literal translation can be, with the KJ, RSV, and NAS, "members in particular" or "individually members of it." Since, however, it is hardly necessary to insist that individuals are individual members of the Church, perhaps "members of a part" or "members of part" can be paraphrased as "according as each one respectively has his own definite part in the body of Christ." The emphasis is on the individual's function, not merely on being a member of the body. The verse cannot mean that the Corinthian church was a part of the Church universal. This is ruled out by the preceding context and by the application in the next verse.

28 "And whom God has placed in the Church, first apostles, second prophets, third teachers, then powers, then gifts of healing, [doers of] good deeds, governors, species of languages."

The punctuation chosen by several translations and even by some Greek editors makes this an incomplete sentence. Others simply drop out the relative pronoun to avoid the poor construction. Neither device is needed. Verses 27 and 28 make a perfectly good sentence. "You collectively are the body of Christ, whom also individually God set in the Church to be apostles and so on."

God organized the Church, not the Corinthian church only, by setting apostles over it as its first and highest officers. During the apostolic age, God also gave verbal messages to some others, including women, who were therefore prophets. Apostles and prophets are no longer with us, but ministers, pastors, overseers, bishops (if properly understood) or teaching elders are today's highest officials. "Powers," in other words, workers of miracles, are or were subordinate to preachers, though the gift of miracles also ceased at the end of the first century. The deacons (?) or doers of good works remain along with the elders. The term "governors" may possibly refer to elders who rule, whether or not they also teach. Clearly one man could hold more than one of the offices

enumerated. Finally, comes the gift of speaking a foreign language. It too is a miracle, and so does not occur today; but it was mentioned separately because it was conspicuous and wide-spread. Obviously, these are not the only gifts that God gives to His people.

29-31 "Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers? Do all have powers? Do all have gifts of healing? Do all speak in languages? Do all translate? Now, be zealous for the greater gifts. And I still show you a way *par excellence*."

In anticipation, note well that Paul lists foreign languages and translations last. He urges the Corinthians, who made so much of languages, to seek the better gifts. Although God distributes His gifts as He pleases, yet it is right for us to desire one or another and to express our desires.

Another point in anticipation is the explicit assertion that as not everybody is an apostle, so not everyone speaks in tongues, and we may infer that not everyone is supposed to do so.

The chapter ends with a sentence that KJ, RSV, and NAS all mistranslate. The familiar words are, "And yet shew I unto you a more excellent way." Now, there is no comparative adjective in the text. Comparison is absent, not only in the modern critical texts, but even in the *Textus-Receptus*. Therefore, a translation must omit the idea of comparison and say, "And I still (or, in addition) show you a way *par excellence*," or words to that effect.

The great damage done by the incorrect translations lies in a serious misunderstanding of the next chapter. Love is considered a more excellent way than, and accordingly a substitute for, wisdom, faith, miracles, and languages, even for apostles, no doubt.

That love should be regarded as a substitute for the apostles and for prophecy ought to have warned everyone that this interpretation is impossible. Ruckert, Estius, and others assert the meaning to be, "I show you a far better way still, in which you may walk, namely, the way of love, which far surpasses all possession of *charismata*."

What Paul says is this: Seek the best gifts, such as wisdom and knowledge, and the way par excellence to seek those gifts is love. Paul is not offering a substitute for faith, miracles, good deeds, but a way to obtain them. Thus the next chapter follows smoothly.

13

1-13 Summary: The excellence of love is set forth in details that cannot well be summarized. As a substitute, a short excursus will be inserted.

For some years now, the concept of love has taken on added importance in theology because of its use in a new theory of ethics. The most extreme and therefore best known form of this theory, and perhaps the most detailed and consistent form, is called "situation-ethics," to which allusions have already been made above.

Not to belabor Joseph Fletcher any farther for his defense of adultery as a Christian virtue, a later and fair example of the theory can be found in *The Love Command in the New Testament* by Victor Paul Furnish (Abingdon Press, 1972).

The basic thesis is that the "love-command" conflicts with and overrides the Ten Commandments and every other precept in the Bible. Furnish says that the love-command is "the criterion and measure by which the law itself, with all its various commandments, is to be judged" (p. 200). Thus, if love dictates occasional polytheism, one is obligated to ignore the first of the Ten Commandments, and so on with the others.

There are two conclusive objections to this theory. The first is that love never gives us any information, and surely no normative directions, as to what to do; and so the theory cannot be applied. Suppose the communists send Asiatic troops to shoot the Hungarians. Does my love for the communists (and of course we should love even the communists) dictate that I must help them, as one of my college students asserted, or does my love for the Hungarians (if liberals can with difficulty imagine the love-command being extended even to the Hungarians and the Czechs) dictate that I shoot

the communists? Karl Barth favored it, or at least condoned, the massacre of the Hungarians; and he was a great theologian. Or, perhaps, my love for my wife, and at times for my neighbor's wife, dictate that I keep out of the fray and love her or them. At this moment of writing (Nov. 1973), the same problem arises with respect to the Arabs and Israelis. Nor is it necessarily the extreme question of joining one army rather than the other. The almost inescapable problem is whether a United States citizen should favor or in any way aid either. The leader of the Mafia, so the newspapers say, gave a million dollars to Israel. However, love never tells a Christian what to do.

The first objection is all the more pertinent when one notes that Furnish tries to connect love with Christ. He says of Paul and John, "the concept of obedience itself is radicalized in such a way that it no longer has reference to the believer's relation to the law, but to the claim of God which is normatively encountered not in the body of the law but in the person and work of Jesus Christ" (p. 200).

However, what is the claim of God? If a man rejects the inerrancy of Scripture, and therefore picks and chooses to suit his taste, what normative power is there to compel him to pick the love-commandment rather than the much maligned and much misunderstood law of an eye for an eye?

There is a second objection to the theory of love-ethics. Furnish and others argue that their theory is the result of the exegesis of Johannine and Pauline texts (p. 23). Now, as to the apostle John, one may quote against Furnish John 14:15, "If ye love me, keep my commandments." Surely, this makes it false to say "the concept of obedience, itself, is radicalized in such a way that it no longer has reference to the believer's relation to the law." Does not the verse explicitly mention the Commandments? However, there is an even clearer and fuller Johannine pronouncement. 1 John 2:5 states "If anyone keeps his word, truly in such a person the love of God has been perfected." To love God is to keep His doctrine, His

precepts, His word. One must say either that love and obedience are synonymous, or that love is the desire to obey and that this desire results in obedience. Full obedience, then, is perfect love. The apostle John does anything but support Furnish's theory. As for the exegesis of Pauline texts, this is precisely what follows in this chapter. The result will not please modern antinomians.

1 "If I should speak in the languages of men and angels, but do not have love, I have become sounding brass [or, copper] or a clanging cymbal."

Since love is the way par excellence to these gifts, one could suppose that it is not the only way. It remains possible, so far as the previous chapter states, to obtain these gifts in other ways. Yet 13:1 does not say that any man actually has the gifts of languages, knowledge, prophecy, or faith, without also having love. The verse is a present general conditional sentence with nothing implied, the verb of the protasis being in the subjunctive with *ean*.

The phrase "languages of men and angels" shows that foreign intelligible languages are meant. The "tongues" of 1 Corinthians are not gibberish. Gibberish can hardly be classified as one of the tongues or languages of men; nor could anyone suppose that the righteous angels speak unintelligibly and irrationally. If sinful man is a rational being, the righteous angels are more so. God is a God of truth, wisdom, and knowledge. His chosen messengers (angels) are not demented. Even if the phrase "of angels" is taken hyperbolically, as Beza did, the sober and literal truth about angels prevents the hyperbole from reducing their conversation to nonsense syllables.

"Love" here is the Greek word *agapē*. This term has been catapulted to prominence in recent years by Bishop Nygren and the situation ethics of Joseph Fletcher. Hodge says, "The Greek word *agapē* is not of heathen origin." However, Hodge wrote before the word had been found in pagan writers; and the verb *agapao* had been in use since the time of Homer. A

lexical study will dispel some of the mystical aura that contemporary writers have placed around it.

Agapaō, according to Liddell and Scott, means to greet with affection, to show affection for the dead; it is God's love for man and man's love for God; it is distinct from *phileō*, which implies regard rather than affection (though Liddell and Scott note that they are interchangeable). It is seldom used for sexual love, though Xenophon connects it with prostitutes. It can mean caress or pet, to be fond of, prize or desire, to be content; and its object can be things as well as persons.

For the noun *agapē* Liddell and Scott list: love, the love of a husband for a wife (in heathen and therefore original Greek usage), love of God for man and man for God, charity, alms, and the love feast.

Arndt and Gingrich, whose lexicon is not a general lexicon of the Greek language, but only of New Testament and Christian literature (and the LXX), have pretty much the same thing: affection for persons; love of God, used interchangeably with *phileō*, love for things (honor, the world, rewards); and similarly for the noun.

In the New Testament *agapē* occurs 116 times and the verb 142 times. John's Gospel has the verb 57 times and I John 28 times, the noun 7 and 18 times. I Corinthians has the verb only twice, and the noun 14 times. The variety of meaning precludes the imaginative restrictions that have recently seeped down to the congregational level.

It would be much too cumbersome to quote the 258 instances of the noun and verb; but to show that the word, itself, apart from the context, does not designate some peculiar religious relationship, suitable for a theory of situation ethics, and surely not a solely intertrinitarian relationship, or anything but "love" in its most general connotations, these few New Testament verses will be quoted.

Ephesians 5:25, 28: "Husbands, love your wives. . . . So husbands ought to love their own wives as their own bodies:

He who loves his own wife loves himself." The omitted words, "as Christ loved the Church," might be used to claim that *agapaō* could not refer either to sexual love or to a love of self-interest. However, the repeated phrase "their own wives," and not wives in general, shows that general benevolence is not meant, and surely not promiscuity; and the phrase "his own body" rules out a disinterested love. The idea is repeated a third time five verses below.

John 21:15-17, which many sermons have subjected to ingenious torture, shows that *agapaō* and *phileō* are interchangeable. Christ asks, Do you love me (*agapaō*)? Peter replies, I love you (*phileō*). The same question and answer are then repeated. Did Peter deliberately change the verb and the meaning? Had Christ referred to some heavenly love, and Peter to some earthly love (or vice versa)? Or had Peter simply used a synonym? John, the author, shows that the words are synonymous. Note: Jesus said the third time, Simon, do you love me (*phileō*). However, Christ had not used *phileō* three times. This was the first time Christ used this verb; but it was the third time for the common meaning. Peter was pained. Now, if the two verbs were not synonymous, the conversation would have been as follows: Peter, if you do not *agapas* me, don't you even *phileis* me? Then Peter, grieved, would have answered, Lord, you know that I *agapo* you. However, this is not what he said.

That *agapaō* can mean, not only the love of one's own wife, but also illicit sex, is clear from Xenophon's *Memorabilia* 1, 5, 4, "enjoy food and wine and love (*agapōnta*) of prostitutes rather than comrades in arms." Xenophon of course was a pagan writer four centuries before Christ, and his use of *agapaō* is rare; nevertheless it shows that the Greek language did not rule out such a meaning.

The purpose of this lexical parenthesis is to divest our minds of any preconceived notions as to what Paul had to mean and what he could not possibly have meant by *agapē*. The sense must be obtained from the New Testament and especially from Pauline usage.

As a preliminary step in specifying the meaning of love, one may cite John 14:15, 21, and John 15:10, 14, where love, if not formally defined as obedience, is so closely connected with it that there seems to be no room for anything else. I John 2:3-5 supports this, and I John 5:2 says, "By this we know that we love (*agapōmen*) the children of God, when we love God and keep his commandments." It would seem therefore that the visible characteristic of love is obedience, and love itself is a desire to obey. Is there any reason to suppose that Paul disagreed with John's concept of love?

2 "And if I have prophecy and know all the secrets and all knowledge, and if I have all faith so as to change the position of mountains, but do not have love, I am nothing."

Again, Paul uses subjunctives in present general conditions, nothing implied. The sentence does not assert that anyone has knowledge and faith without having love. The converse seems to be implied: a person without love, one who habitually refuses to obey the commandments, does not have knowledge and faith. Surely Paul would never write a chapter to deny justification by faith alone and assert justification by obedience. Here indeed is the key to the paradoxes, the seeming contradictions, that arise from this chapter: love or obedience is a good work that is inseparably connected with faith and regeneration. It is neither the basis nor the means of justification; but a faith or an alleged faith that does not evidence itself in love or good works is not saving faith.

3 "And if I shall give away all my property [to feed the poor], and if I hand over my body to be burned, and do not have love, it does me no good."

Instead of the present general subjunctive of the previous verses, Paul here uses the future indicative. At least almost all the uncials have it, though many cursives repeat the subjunctive construction. The verb itself carries the connotation of giving away food, and hence KJ and NAS refer to feeding the poor. RSV has simply, "If I give away all I have." This is more literal, though the connotation of food is not preserved.

The next phrase, with the verb "to burn," also faces textual difficulties. Here again, the best MSS differ from the more numerous. The latter have *kauthēsōmai*, "in order that I may be burned." However, the form *kauthēsōmai* is an artificially constructed future subjunctive, and there are no future subjunctives in Greek. Some MSS have *kauthesomai*, with an omicron instead of an omega. It is future indicative. It would mean, "in order that I shall be burned." This is correct grammar (for purpose clauses are both subjunctive and indicative), and it makes good sense. However, the MS evidence is poor. The best evidence favors a verb that has nothing to do with burning: *kauchēsōmai*, "though I give my body in order that I may boast." Although supported by P 46, Aleph. A, B, two objections attach. First, it too is an impossible future subjunctive. Second, the sense is implausibly strained. One would have to interpret: though I hand over my body, not in order to serve Christ or advance the Church, but in order to boast of my own prowess. . . . Such a motive is of course disreputable, but it is too obviously disreputable to fit the Pauline context. Paul is not focusing on obviously shameful conduct, but on acts that are in themselves praiseworthy: speaking in the languages of angels, prophesying, faith, and almsgiving. It would seem therefore that here, for once the almost overwhelming agreement of the best MSS is wrong.

4-7 "Love is long-suffering, love is merciful; it is not jealous, does not brag, is not arrogant, is not indecent, does not seek its own [advantage], does not throw tantrums, does not reckon up evil, does not rejoice in injustice, but rejoices with [others?] in truth; keeps all things confidential, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things."

That love and obedience are coextensive may be seen in this list of love's characteristics. Long-suffering and mercy, essentially synonymous, is commanded in Hosea 12:6, "keep mercy and judgment"; also, in Proverbs 3:3, "Let not mercy and truth forsake thee." The list contains truth farther down.

Other verses commanding mercy are easily found. If anyone insists upon a verse with the word "long-suffering" in it, there are many that refer to the long-suffering of God. With reference to man, the word itself is found in Matthew 18:26, 29 (surely with approbation); so also, Hebrews 6:15, and the noun (in the present verse, it is a verb) is commanded in Hebrews 6:12. The finding of other verses, as the mathematics textbooks say, is left as an exercise for the devout student.

Jealousy is prohibited in Proverbs 6:34 (by implication at least), Acts 7:9 and 17:5, the noun in Romans 13:13, and James 3:14, 16. Bragging or boasting was forbidden in 4:7 above; but also in Psalm 49:6, Isaiah 10:15, Romans 1:30 (though it is a different Greek word), and James 3:5 and 4:16.

Arrogance and indecency have already been mentioned in I Corinthians, and they are also condemned in other places. Greediness, tantrums . . . and is it not clear that all these are forbidden in the commandments, and their opposites are precisely the characteristics of love? If somehow the term *love* carries connotations that seem absent in the divine precepts, the reason is that the precepts, or most of them, can be obeyed externally by a hypocrite, whereas the term *love* denotes sincerity. Love is the volition—love is not an emotion—the *volition* to do good to others. It must be a volition because God *commands* "Thou shalt love . . ." and commands are addressed to the will. As for emotions, a philosophy professor who wished to write a few paragraphs on emotion read four fairly thick textbooks on emotion written by four respected American professors of psychology, and not one of them could tell what an emotion is.

A few subsidiary points are these. The phrase "rejoices with [others?] in truth" could be simply "rejoices in the truth." However, the previous *rejoice* in "does not rejoice in injustice," has an uncompounded verb (*chairei*); and then comes the preposition *epi*, "does not rejoice upon injustice."

However, the second verb is a compound, to rejoice with (*sugchairei*), followed by a simple dative. What force to assign to the *sug* is a matter of guesswork.

It may be that love rejoices in all truth, including mathematics and botany; but more likely, Paul means the Gospel. Similarly, the four instances of *all* that follow must be interpreted with limitations. Love certainly would not keep all things confidential; it would report cases of rape and murder to the police. Obviously, love does not, or should not believe all things; slanders, lies, and false doctrine; nor does it hope all things, as wishing that a young man might die of cancer. Arminians who stress the word *all* in their attack on the limited atonement should read these verses, as well as John 17, and consider whether Arminianism can be consistent.

8 "Love never falls down. If there be prophecies, they will be abolished. If there be languages, they shall cease. If knowledge, it will be abolished."

There is some difference of opinion on the meaning of this verse. Meyer holds that the gifts mentioned will pass away at the coming of Christ. This implies that the canon is not closed and that sources other than the Bible should be normative for theology. It implies that miracles continue, as the Romanists claim, and that the contemporary tongues movement has apostolic authority.

The usual Protestant doctrine is that prophecy, miracles, and the gift of speaking in foreign tongues ceased at the end of the apostolic age. Second century Christian literature seems to be devoid of accounts of these gifts.

On the other hand, did knowledge cease when the apostles died? Theologians today may well know more about what the apostles wrote than the apostles themselves; and surely we know more than did Justin Martyr (whose writings cause us to wonder whether he was a Christian at all). Besides this, we shall know more in heaven than we do today. How then can Paul say that knowledge will be abolished. Perhaps the next verse helps to answer this question.

9-10 "For we know [only] a part and we prophesy [only] a part. But when the completion comes, the partial will be abolished."

This verse is stated as a reason for the preceding and therefore explains it. This explanation considerably alters the impression derived from the preceding verse taken alone. Naturally, completion abolishes partiality. Hodge accepts as probable the interpretation that our future knowledge will be so different from our present knowledge that it should be called by a different name. However, for one who has been justified by belief in Christ alone, it is difficult to believe that the doctrine of justification by belief alone will not be believed in heaven. If it is, then this part of our present knowledge will be identical to that part of our future knowledge. Is it not more in keeping with the concept of God as truth and of Christ as wisdom and logos to say that our knowledge in heaven will be like the inscription of the regular solids in the sphere in comparison with the theorem that two sides and the included angle make the two triangles equal? Can more advanced truths make simpler truths untrue?

While all this is clear, it does not answer the question of the closing of the canon and the cessation of tongues. On this point, it must be noted that the verse, itself, taken alone, gives no indication when prophecy, miracles, and tongues shall cease. The verse does not even say that they will cease at the same time. The best evidence that history can give is that tongues and apostles vanished after A.D. 100.

There is one other phrase, not so far mentioned: "When the completion comes," or "when that which is perfect comes." This raises the question: Completion of what? It could be the completion of the canon. Miracles and tongues were for the purpose of guaranteeing the divine origin of apostolic doctrine. They ceased when the revelation was completed.

Even the word *knowledge* is better understood this way. Instead of comparing present-day extensive study of the New

Testament with Justin's painfully inadequate understanding of the Atonement, it would be better to take *knowledge* as the apostolic process of revealing new knowledge. This was completed and revelation ceased.

11 "When I was a little boy, I talked like a little boy, I thought like a little boy, I argued like a little boy. When I became a man, I abolished childish things."

The same difficulty continues. Little boys have poor judgment, very little boys cannot count (or, argue) correctly, and they desire trivialities. Insofar as they are mistaken, childish attitudes should be abolished as they grow up. However, when their childish thoughts are true, when they first learn that two and two are four; and when their childish attitudes are correct, as when they respect their parents, are these to be abolished? Respect may be enlarged with a greater understanding of parental responsibility, and arithmetic may be completed with calculus, but are the earlier truths—the truths, not the mistakes—to be discarded? How can Meyer say, "With the advent of the Parousia the other charismata too surely shall cease altogether: not simply that the imperfection of the way in which they are exercised ceases"? It is hard to believe that this is what Paul meant.

12 "For now we see an indistinct image through a [brass] mirror, but then face to face. Now I know in part, but then I shall know as also I was known."

This is a sort of explanation or illustration to enforce the thought of the previous three verses. Our present knowledge is indistinct, lacking in detail, relatively correct only in general outline. However, in the consummation, we shall see not a dim image, but a clear face. All the details will be distinct. So much is clear: partial knowledge will become complete knowledge.

However, what can Paul mean by the phrase, "but then I shall know as also I was known"? On the surface, this seems to say that in heaven, human creatures will know everything the Creator knows with the same completeness and clarity.

Of course, it cannot mean that somehow we shall have achieved an eternal knowledge that dates back before our birth and before the world began. Even so, it is stupendous to think that we shall know as much as God.

Meyer stresses the aorist, "I was known," not "I am known," as the KJ has it. "This cannot mean," he says, "then shall I know as also I am known, i. e., as God knows me . . . , but (observe the aorist) as also I was known, which points back to the era of conversion. . . ."

However, this is far from necessary. "As I was known" could be taken as the result of Paul's projecting himself into heaven and looking back at all his present life, not just to his conversion, spectacular though it was. Further, although the verb to *know* can refer to God's choosing or approving a man, this chapter is not contrasting our partial choice or approval with our later complete approval. The subject matter has been faith, prophecies, knowledge of all secrets, all knowledge, and in 13:1, languages of men and angels. What is still worse for Meyer's attempt to restrict this knowledge to the moment of conversion, is that his summary of the meaning expresses just what he set out to deny; namely, that man's knowledge becomes as complete as God's. For he says, "But then will my knowledge of God be so wholly different from a merely partial one, as it is now, that, on the contrary, it will correspond to the divine knowledge, so far as it once at my conversion made me its object, namely (opposite of *ek merous*) by complete knowledge of the divine counsel, will, etc., which present themselves to me now only in part." Here, the reference to conversion does not avoid the conclusion that we shall know the divine counsel and will completely.

13 "But now there remain faith, hope, love, these three; but the greatest of these is love."

How simple these words seem, and how often repeated with unction, but it is not all that simple. The *Minutes* of the 149th General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church,

Evangelical Synod, May 14-20, 1971, on page 95, in discussing "tongues" says:

"1 Cor. 13:8-13 teaches when the gifts will end. The gifts will have no more purpose when the perfect comes. The perfect is described as mature manhood, seeing clearly, and understanding fully. This cannot mean the completion of the NT canon by the apostles. The perfect will come when the Lord Jesus returns. . . . Until our Lord returns, Paul says, the gifts, temporary as they are, will remain."

However, the study committee who wrote the report are mistaken: This is not what Paul says. He says some will remain and some will not. In 12:28, Paul lists the gifts as apostolic authority and prophecy first. Does the Synod report wish to maintain that God has appointed some to be apostles in the tenth, fifteenth, and twentieth centuries? This would be good Romanism; but Protestants think otherwise. Surely the apostleship has ceased. Hence, the time of cessation that Paul implies is not the return of Christ, but the completion of the canon. Similarly, the verse itself does not say that all the gifts are to remain. It says only that faith, hope, and love remain, *these three*, and no others are mentioned.

There is another, though related, difficulty. It centers in the word "now." This word may be taken in a strictly temporal sense or it could introduce the logical conclusion of the preceding argument.

If it be taken temporally, a subsidiary difficulty appears. The "now" could refer to the remainder of the apostolic age and to nothing later; or it could refer to the time from A.D. 100 to the return of Christ. Or, perhaps, it could refer also to conditions after the Judgment.

It can hardly refer to the remainder of the apostolic age alone, for then there would be no contrast between the charismata that are passing away and the three virtues that remain. Hence, although it seems awkward for Paul to use the word "now" to designate a time that begins only after his

death, such must be the meaning, if "now" is to be understood temporally.

However, if "now" begins at A.D. 100, when does it end? Does it end at Christ's return, so that there would be no faith, hope, or love in heaven? Or, do these virtues remain in heaven forever? The preceding verses say that some things cease about A.D. 100, and therefore could not remain in heaven: prophecies and languages, for example. Even knowledge is said to vanish away. Yet, though miraculous languages will cease, this cannot be true of knowledge, for the text says plainly that we shall know as we have been known. Partial knowledge is replaced with such a fuller knowledge that the former seems like nothing at all. However, most certainly the heaven of the God who is truth itself cannot be devoid of knowledge.

It may be said that faith does not remain in heaven, for faith is lost in sight (II Cor. 5:7); but this, too, is the same colloquial manner of speaking. Do we not continue to *believe* the truth of justification and limited atonement in heaven? However, what must be conclusive for most Christians is that love indubitably remains in heaven.

Charles Wesley, who was not quite so heretical as his more famous brother, nevertheless managed to instill some nonbiblical ideas into many Christians' minds by his very popular hymn, "Where faith is sweetly lost in sight, And hope in full supreme delight, And everlasting love." However, this hymn is in stark contradiction to what the verse itself says, for Paul wrote that all these remain.

Perhaps, then, the word "now" is not temporal; perhaps it designates the logical conclusion, or at least a summary of the chapter's argument. Understanding the "now" as a logical inference, the interpretation would be: Because the gifts mentioned in the earlier verses pass away, faith, hope, and love are the only ones to remain. Of course, this is an invalid inference because a necessary premise is missing. Clearly, a cessation of miracles does not *imply* that faith or love re-

mains. That is to say, the cessation of miracles is not the *reason why* anything remains. The charismata could cease and, from a purely logical point of view, love could cease too. Hence no implication is intended. Furthermore, the earlier verses relating to the cessation of gifts are strictly temporal. Therefore, the natural interpretation would continue the notion of time in this verse also. With this temporal idea one can take the verse, not as a conclusion, but simply as an additional item of information, and can paraphrase it as: But now as a matter of fact, these three remain.

Finally, if the essence of love is obedience, its temporal continuance in heaven is supported by the Lord's Prayer, Thy will be done on earth, as it always has been and always will be done in heaven.

Note: The number of times a word occurs in the New Testament—142 instances of *agapao*—has been taken from a concordance based on the Textus Receptus.

1-25 Summary: Earnestly seek spiritual gifts, especially prophecy. Prophecy edifies the Church because it is intelligible. Tongues, unless the message is translated into Greek, are not understood and therefore do not edify. Edification is of major concern. Five intelligible words are of more value than ten thousand in a foreign language. Therefore prophecy is superior to tongues.

1 "Pursue love, but seek spiritual gifts, but rather that you prophesy."

Since love is the greatest of all gifts, the Apostle requires the Corinthians to pursue it. At the same time, and in no conflict with love, they are to seek spiritual gifts, and of these spiritual gifts, prophecy is especially important. Since the next verse introduces the idea of foreign languages, it is worth noting that Acts 19:6 suggests a common concurrence of prophecy and languages. It may be puzzling why the Holy Spirit so frequently gave these two gifts to newly converted Christians, but the conjunction of the two is natural. The conjunction of prophecy and speaking in tongues is a natural combination at least to the extent that both give verbal expression to the Gospel. There is not a perfect concordance, however, because speaking a language is not always a case of special revelation, as prophecy by definition is. Nor does this clearly answer why the Spirit gave the gift of tongues so frequently—so frequently to the Corinthians and not to the Galatians and Ephesians.

2 "For he who speaks a language does not talk to men, but to God, and no one hears, but he speaks secrets by the Spirit."

It is perhaps appropriate here to refer back to 12:10, 29-31, and 13:1, where tongues were mentioned. These

tongues were not described in the earlier chapter. The commentary on the latter verse showed that the tongues were actual human languages like Latin, Aramaic, or Persian. The text identified them as the languages of men. The word *glōssa* can mean a tongue of land or a leathern thong, or the organ in one's mouth; but it is very difficult, if not impossible, to find an instance in Greek where it means *gibberish*. It often refers to talkativeness and useless garrulity; but even so the words are those of natural languages. The account of Pentecost in Acts clearly describes what the apostles spoke; Paul here presupposes that everyone knows what he is talking about; therefore the description in Acts should govern the exegesis of 1 Corinthians, and the latter should not alter the former.

Though this seems to be a compelling reason for identifying the tongues of this chapter as actual foreign languages, many commentators refuse to agree. Consider the following views, quoted in their chronological order:

Joseph Agar Beet, in 1882 (*Commentary*, pp. 259-260), wrote: "That it was not a miraculous faculty of speaking one or more foreign languages is made absolutely certain by Paul's taking for granted (1 Cor. 14:2-5, 13, 19, 28) when comparing the gifts of prophecy and of tongues . . . that apart from interpretation the gift of tongues is of no use whatever to any but the speaker. . . . That the mind (v. 14) had no part in the utterance and that the speaker was sometimes unable (vv. 13, 28) to interpret to others his own words, implies that, unless he had also the gift of interpretation, he did not himself understand them."

Conybeare and Howson in their famous *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul* (Charles Scribners Sons, 1887; pp. 426-427) argue: "it was not a *knowledge* of foreign languages . . . [because it was not] exercised for the conversion of foreign nations.¹ . . . this gift was the result of a sudden influx of

1. Why could it not have been a *knowledge*, even if it were not used in evangelism? Must a knowledge of languages always be used to convert unbelievers?

supernatural inspiration . . . under its influence the exercise of the understanding was suspended, while the spirit was rapt into a state of ecstasy. . . . In this ecstatic trance the believer was constrained by an irresistible power . . . the words which issued from his mouth were not his own; he was even (usually) ignorant of their meaning; they were the words of some foreign language, and not intelligible to the bystanders. . . ." Note that Conybeare and Howson acknowledge that the words were the words of an actual foreign language; but below reasons will be given for rejecting several other of their assertions.

H. L. Goudge (*The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 1903, p. 135) gives the Irvingites as evidence that the Corinthians spoke gibberish, and on the next page even suggests that Peter in Acts also spoke gibberish and did not preach the Gospel.

Leon Morris (*Commentary*, in *loc.*, 1958) argues: "No man understandeth him makes it plain that the gift spoken of here is different from that in Acts ii, where all men understood." This argument is poor because Acts 2:8, 13 indicate that while the Cretans and Arabians understood, the Palestinian Jews did not, and charged the disciples with drunkenness.

Frank Stagg (*Glossolalia*, with Hinson *et al.*, 1967, p. 38) says, "Unintelligible. The 'tongues' at Corinth were not languages like Aramaic, Greek, or Latin. They were motor phenomena brought on under the excitement of religious experience." For evidence, he cites 14:8, 11, 19, 20, and he continues, "It is not defensible to identify the 'tongues' at Corinth with what Luke describes at Pentecost."

The present verse is a reason for the preceding verse. The Corinthians are commanded to prefer prophecy to languages because the latter are of little or no use in the church. Such had not always been the case. At Pentecost, the Apostles spoke in foreign tongues and the crowds understood. However, in Corinth, everybody spoke Greek and no one understood the languages of the Elamites and the dwellers in

Mesopotamia. Thus, in Corinth, the languages were intelligible only to God, and no one in the congregation heard, in other words, understood. Why the Spirit continued to give the gift of tongues when the situation at Pentecost no longer obtained can hardly be answered. Paul, himself, seems puzzled, and, while admitting the fact, uses the chapter to warn against excesses.

The last phrase of the verse, "he speaks mysteries by the Spirit," is difficult. Parallelism with the phrase, "he speaks to God" would seem to require "he speaks mysteries to spirit" (*pneumati*, dative without a preposition, as *theó* before). However, if contrasted with *theó*, it would mean, he speaks mysteries to his own spirit. So indeed Meyer takes it, assuming, contrary to Scripture, that *spirit* indicates some faculty superior to understanding (superior both to *psychê* and to *nous*).

To say that the person speaks to the Holy Spirit seems to be a pale and useless repetition of the first clause. Hence the best interpretation is to break the parallel of datives and say that he speaks secrets by the power of the Holy Spirit, even though no one understands what he says.

As has been made clear several times in the previous chapters, mysteries are divinely revealed propositions. Hence they cannot be nonsense; they must be intelligible; and if anyone speaks them, he must use intelligible language. However, the fact that the man was speaking secrets or mysteries does not of itself prove that he was prophesying. The two verses show that while prophecy and speaking in languages can coincide, they did not always do so. When the Corinthian Christian spoke a mystery, he was not necessarily or even usually the first to receive, know, and publish that secret. That is to say, he may have been expounding some part of the gospel previously revealed. As will be seen, some speaking in tongues was prayer; and it would be most extraordinary if a prayer were a new revelational disclosure. Agabus in Acts 21:11 prophesied—he told something no one knew before; but it is

possible that the preaching of the apostles, even on the day of Pentecost when they spoke in tongues, was not prophesying.

Paul, therefore, in these two verses expresses a preference for prophecy. Even when a disclosure in a foreign language happens to be a prophecy, plain prophecy, or even ordinary preaching, is superior to tongues because the language is understandable to those present, as the next verse says:

3-4 "But he who prophesies speaks to men edification, comfort, and encouragement. He who speaks in a language edifies himself. But the prophet edifies the church."

The New Bible Commentary: Revised by Guthrie, and others (Eerdmans, 1970), on 12:10 says, "Various kinds of tongues (cf. 14:1 ff.): i.e. ecstatic speech in languages usually unknown (14:9. cf. Acts 2:6) apart from the gift of interpretation (14:13)." On 14:4, Guthrie says, "He is edified, not indeed in his understanding (cf. v. 14), but by what has been called 'the glow of the soul associated with the exercise of the gift' (cf. Acts 2:13)."

These words seem to agree that the words of the tongues were the words of ordinary human languages, unknown to the speaker unless God gave him the translation. What the author means by ecstatic is hard to say. If he means that the speaker speaks without self-control, for the dictionary defines it as beyond all reason and self-control, the author contradicts the implication of Paul's command in 14:28. The author says also that the speaker is not edified in his understanding. This statement must be rejected. Paul gives the reason why those present were not edified: they were not edified because they did not understand what the man was saying. They did not grasp the intelligible meaning. However, if the man, himself, was edified, as Paul says he was, then he must have understood; for if he could be edified without understanding, so could the others. This point becomes clearer still as we proceed. It applies even more to the modern Pentecostals than to Guthrie; for if gibberish could edify the speaker, it could also edify the church, and no translation would be needed.

5 "I want all of you to speak in languages, but more that you should prophesy. The prophet is greater than he who speaks in languages, unless he translates so that the church may receive edification."

The absolute statement, "I want all of you to speak in languages," rather exaggerates Paul's meaning. The translation is literal enough, but the context supplies some modifiers. In the earlier chapter, verses 10 and 30 show that it was not God's will that all should speak in tongues. The gift was given to some only. Thus Paul's meaning could be expressed as, I would like you all to speak in tongues, God willing. Or, more clearly, and in conformity with 14:39 below, Paul *takes pleasure* (a possible translation of *thelō*) in all who speak in tongues, and in general wishes that every Corinthian should have as many gifts as possible, knowing full well that no one in any congregation could have all.

Paul states his approval of speaking in languages because he does not wish to be misunderstood. Languages are a good gift, but there is something better. Understandable prophecy is better than unknown languages. At least the prophet is the superior unless the speaker in foreign languages translates what he has said.

The procedure of having another person translate seems to be based on the assumption that the speaker in languages does not understand what he is saying. This might be the case in some instances, as 14:28 rather clearly implies; but the present verse shows that usually the speaker, himself, is to translate his own message. If the message edifies the speaker, even if it does not edify the church, the speaker must have understood it. All of this proves that the message is not gibberish: the words have an intellectual content.

Excursus on Pentecostalism

The Full Gospel Business Men's Voice of September 1971 carries an article "New life is permeating the Church today after four years of Gentle Revolution. The Catholic Pente-

costal Movement in Retrospect." After briefly referring to Pentecostalist successes among Protestant denominations, the article says, "In the light of Scripture therefore one should not have been surprised when, in the spring of 1966 a flame was kindled at Duquesne University in Pittsburg, Pa., and the baptism in the Holy Spirit began to sweep campus after campus of the Catholic universities, and to involve the priests, nuns, and laymen of that faith." Notre Dame is then mentioned, and the periodical carries some well composed color pictures of that campus, two of which are the same stone statue of Christ.

The article is mainly a good news article, and doctrine is almost totally absent; it mentions other news media that identified the leadership of the movement as "priests, nuns, religious, and deeply dedicated laymen." *The New York Times* is quoted, "Pentecostalism that has generally been identified with Protestant Christianity is rapidly becoming an important new force among Roman Catholics."

The next article in the same issue is a personal testimony by a Catholic student, James J. Cavnar. He claims to have received special, verbal revelations from Christ: "the Lord had told us in prophecy that news was going to come that would change the direction of our lives. . . . Then the Lord admonished us in a prophecy, 'What would you like to know about me and about your lives and about the world in which you live and about your future? I will tell you. . . .'" These last words, as quoted, are printed in quotation marks as a direct verbal statement of Christ to Mr. Cavnar.

The third article is a somewhat similar personal testimony. The fourth, also a personal testimony by a Roman Catholic, contains the information that when the person began to speak in tongues, he "did not know the meaning" of the words he pronounced (p. 21). He also relates his visit to a girl dying of cancer of the spine: "We prayed, the Lord healed her, and she was baptized within two weeks."

The following article, "The Spokane Story," is essentially

the work of a Pentecostalist pastor as told to the reporter who wrote it up. It is not authored by a Roman Catholic as the others were. The article characterizes the Roman Catholic developments as "The move toward unity in the Spirit." Later it says, "There has been no attempt to proselyte in either direction, but rather a remarkable blending."

The next article reports three other verbal, special revelations from the Lord, identified as "prophecy." The final article is a statement by Edward D. O'Connor, C.S.C., member of the Theological Department at the University of Notre Dame. Its wording is rather general than specific, but its commendatory tone is clearly discernible.

The contents of this issue of *Voice* have been reproduced at some length for the purpose of showing how the Pentecostalists regard themselves in their relations with Roman Catholics. The editor, of course, chose and published the testimonies of the Roman Catholics, and the other article is substantially the thoughts and words of a Pentecostalist minister, also chosen and thereby approved by the editor.

Several things immediately strike any reader who is not asleep. First, the tongues experience is tremendously important. If it is not true to say that nothing else matters, it nonetheless seems true to say that nothing else matters very much. Speaking in tongues is the chief mark of a dedicated Christian. The clear implication is that the worship of the virgin Mary is unobjectionable, if one speaks in tongues. There is little point in justification by faith alone, one can accept merit from the treasury of the Saints, transubstantiation can be acknowledged; if only one speaks in tongues. Still more fundamental, one can place tradition on a level with Scripture and even assert new revelations from God, if only one speaks in tongues. The Pentecostalist minister, note well, said, "There has been no attempt to proselyte." In other words, Romanism is acceptable, if only one speaks in tongues.

The Westminster Confession, the greatest summary of

biblical doctrine and Reformation theology, says, "There is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ; not can the Pope of Rome in any sense be the head thereof, but is that antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the church against Christ, and all that is called God."

Edward D. O'Connor, whose article in the *Voice* was so brief, has more to say in *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church* (Notre Dame, Ave Maria Press, 1971). "Although they derive from Protestant backgrounds, the Pentecostal churches are not typically Protestant. . . . Catholics who have accepted Pentecostal spirituality have found it to be fully in harmony with their traditional faith and life. They experience it, not as a borrowing from an alien religion, but as a connatural development of their own" (pp. 23, 28). *Pentecost in the Catholic Church*, by the same author, states, "Some people have been brought to a frequent use of the sacrament of Penance through the experience of baptism in the Spirit. Others have discovered a place for devotion to Mary in their lives, whereas previously they had been indifferent or even antipathetic towards her. One of the most striking effects of the Holy Spirit's action has been to stir up devotion to the Real Presence in the Eucharist" (pp. 14, 15).

Thus the Benedictine scholar reports that Pentecostalism stimulates Penance, Mariolatry, and the Mass. Note that all these are instances of "justification" by works. Especially note that they all, and particularly the Mass, imply the inadequacy of Christ's sacrifice on the cross: we must do something further in order to earn sufficient merit.

That the nominally Protestant Pentecostals are so favorably disposed toward Romanism is not altogether surprising. They are Arminians. Arminius was the first (the Anabaptists can hardly be classed with the Reformers) to take a step, a rather large step, away from Protestantism. It was he in his opposition who enumerated the five points of Calvinism. The consequent Wesleyanism introduced instantaneous,

sinless perfection. These ideas were soon exported to America. For more of the history and especially for a thorough biblical analysis of these developments, everyone should read as much as he can of B. B. Warfield's two thick volumes on *Perfectionism*. Out of this holiness movement, Pentecostalism arose. The replacement of free grace by free will is *ipso facto* a theory of salvation by works and human merit. Hence the affinity between Pentecostalism and Romanism is not too surprising.

Since the commentary on this chapter refutes Pentecostalism at every verse, this excursus can well omit most of the theology and conclude with some actual events, conduct, and experience. Surely their strong emphasis on experience permits the examination of their procedures. Of course, one Pentecostalist assembly differs from another, and from itself at several times. An examination therefore can only enumerate instances, as personal testimonies do. Only two will be given. No doubt two is an insufficient sample, but other sampling is left to other observers.

Some of the modern Pentecostals, after a person has spoken gibberish, have an interpreter "translate" the message for the congregation. *The Modern Tongues Movement* by Robert G. Gromacki (Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co.) has the following footnote on page 114: "Walvoord tells of a young seminarian who memorized one of the Psalms in Hebrew. At a tongues meeting, he stood to his feet and pretended to be speaking in tongues as he recited the Psalm. After he had finished, the interpreter woefully failed in translating what had been spoken."

The present writer has a friend, a seminary professor, who did the same thing in Greek. Then, an interpreter arose and translated, but the translation was the veriest Pentecostalist propaganda and had no verbal correspondence to the New Testament words quoted.

How a person who claims to be filled with the *Holy Spirit*

can indulge in such chicanery would make an interesting psychological research problem.

6 "But now, brethren, if I come to you speaking in languages, what benefit shall I be to you unless I speak to you in a revelation, or in knowledge, or in prophecy, or in teaching?"

Because of a difficult verse further on, which some people try to absolutize without consideration of these verses that precede it, everyone should note how Paul stresses intelligibility. This verse and the next several place great emphasis on intellectual comprehension. Edification depends on understanding. Paul could confer no benefit at all on the Corinthians if he spoke in Chinese, let alone gibberish. To edify, Paul must give them a revelation, some knowledge, some instruction. God is the God of truth and wisdom. He does not bless nonsense. What the people needed then, what they had needed centuries before, and what people need today is an intelligible, verbal communication of truth—knowledge, information, doctrine, as in Genesis 15 and Jeremiah 1:4, 5, 9.

This is a point inattention to which brought the Reformed Presbyterian report into confusion. Its authors wrote, "Both Paul and modern tongues speakers say that the gift does not involve the mind (14:14). This brings an additional problem: if the nature of tongues does not involve the mind, how can the gift fulfill its function of edifying the individual? There are no rational answers to this problem because we don't fully know as we are fully known. Perhaps we can draw an example of this nonrational edifying from our own experience of Christian fellowship. Why are we not even tempted to stay home and listen to the very best preacher we can find on the radio? Isn't it because we are edified by the physical presence of other believers?" (Minutes, 1971, p. 95).

This quoted passage is incredible. Consider these points. (1) It is doubtless true that modern Pentecostals deny the involvement of the mind in tongues phenomena. However,

Paul did not. If it were not for the single verse 14:14, no one would ever have thought so. From 14:1-13, Paul emphasizes understanding; and presumably the apostles in Acts 2:4, 6, 8, 11 understood what they were saying. "Presumably" because the text does not explicitly say that James and John understood what they were preaching. Neither does it say that they did not understand. To suppose that they did not, deprives the apostles of a deliberate intention to preach the Gospel and reduces the miracle to the level of magic. Therefore, that the speaker, himself, could translate the Persian language into Greek is almost indisputable evidence that the mind was involved.

(2) If the mind were not involved, there would be, as the Report says, the problem of explaining how nonsense could be edifying to the speaker. The Report acknowledges that there is no rational solution to this problem. Such an impasse should have warned the writers to retrace their steps and see what mistake they had made to get into such a jam. They then should have discovered that their erroneous idea was that nonsense could edify. This is what Paul explicitly says is impossible. However, instead of correcting their misstep and returning to Paul's assertion, they propose, since there is no rational solution, an irrational one.

(3) Even apart from Paul's assertion that gibberish cannot edify, this imaginative solution is not a solution. There are two reasons: (a) In the churches we attend, the people do not spout nonsense syllables, and hence our congregations do not furnish the example required. (b) Some people are indeed tempted to stay home and listen to the radio preacher. This may be because of laziness, or physical infirmity, or also because the famous preacher is more understandable and edifying than the local pastor. In this last case, the additional edification resulting from attendance is not thought to be sufficient to make up the difference. (c) Then finally, the physical presence of other believers never edifies. If mere physical presence could edify, we would be edified merely by

sitting next to a Christian on a bus even when we did not know that the man was a Christian. If we knew he was a Christian, the mind would be involved, and this is what the Report was concerned to deny. Furthermore, it is not clear that the known members of the congregation edify us very much at all, unless they somehow instruct us. Physical presence of known Christians may edify us a minimal amount by informing us that they have persevered in grace; though even this may be an incorrect inference from their physical presence. A large number of people present may inform us that our efforts to build up the congregation have had some effect; and this can encourage us. However, I rather suppose we attend church instead of sitting at home, not in order to be edified by the congregation, but because God so commands us to worship Him and because we are endeavoring to support the pastor in publishing the Gospel in the community. We may indeed be edified by talking to our fellow members after the service, but anything more than a minimal amount of edification requires a more extensive divine revelation. That is why pastors must preach.

7-9 "Similarly inanimate objects giving off a sound, either a flute or a cithara, if it does not give a distinction in tones, how can what is piped or what is harped be known? For also if the trumpet gives an unclear sound, who will prepare for war? So you also through the tongues. Unless you give a recognizable message, how shall what is spoken be known? For you will be speaking into the air."

Could Paul have made it any plainer that nonsense does not edify? If a bugle is so badly blown that the soldiers cannot tell whether it is reveille, taps, or chow, what good is the bugle? There must be a "recognizable message," "an intelligible discourse," a *eusēmon logon*. Only such can edify. However, since the speaker, himself, is edified (14:4), it follows that his mind was involved and that he understood what he said.

10 "There are doubtless so many species of sounds (*phōnōn*), and none is soundless (*aphōnōn*)."

This is an overliteral translation given to show the two instances of the word for *sound*. The verse could mean, though it is improbable, that all sounds, bugle, thunder, the screech of machinery, have a meaning. However, the word *soundless* is frequently used of nonspeaking idols. In Acts 8:32, it is used of the lamb that before the shearer is dumb. II Peter 2:16 describes Balaam's dumb ass speaking in a human language (*phōnē*). Compare II Peter 1:17-18. The present verse, therefore, must be understood to say that no language lacks the essential characteristic of language, namely, intelligibility, from which it again follows that the "tongues," even though Paul uses the term *glōssa*, are *phōnai*, and therefore intelligible.

11 "Accordingly if I do not know the power of the sound, I shall be a barbarian to the speaker and the speaker a barbarian for me."

Again, this is an overliteral translation. The "power" of speech is intelligibility; and if Paul does not know the language in which someone speaks to him, the two persons will be barbarians to each other. The meaning of the verse is too clear to need a commentary; but what needs to be emphasized in a time when Pentecostalism is popular is the great emphasis Paul places on understanding the intellectual content of an intelligible language. All this context must be kept in mind in order not to be misled by a difficult phrase three verses below.

12 "So also you, since you are zealous for spirits, seek the edification of the Church in order to abound."

The first phrase of the verse applies the principles of the previous verses to the Corinthians, themselves. With the reference to edification, Paul's emphasis on intelligibility becomes almost tedious, and the present commentator's altogether so. The Corinthians are zealous for spirits. The word is not "spiritual gifts" (*pneumatikōn*); but "spirits" (*pneumatōn*). Hodge, trying to make it refer to gifts, assimilates it to phrases such as, the *spirits* of the prophets, and the seven

spirits of God. The same idea of gifts is obliquely suggested by Galatians 5:17: "the spirit lusteth against the flesh." This would justify the interpretation that the "spirits" the Corinthians sought were their own human minds more fully empowered by the Holy Spirit. Meyer, on the other hand, finds a derogatory reference to many spirits as opposed to the One Spirit who gives divine gifts. This seems strained. Hodge's meaning makes good sense; and whatever awkwardness there is in the word *spirits*, his reference to 12:7 and his interpretation of the present word as "manifestations of the Spirit" is about the best that can be done.

The last half of the verse can be taken in two slightly different ways. One may put the emphasis on edification or on abounding. What purpose does Paul recommend to the Corinthians? He might mean: Seek in order to abound for the edification of the Church. As Hodge says, "The end or object to be sought is not that they might excel . . . the ultimate object [is] the edification of the Church." It is true that edification is an object or even the essential idea in Paul's argument. Yet the actual wording of the verse puts the emphasis on *excel* or *abound*. "In order to abound," the purpose clause, stands last and is therefore emphatic. "Edification" is buried in the middle of the sentence; and it is not part of the stated purpose. Consider this possibility: the verse has begun the concluding application to the Corinthians, themselves. Instead of general principles only, even such important principles as intelligibility and edification; the personal opinions of the Corinthians, themselves, are now brought into focus. They were desirous of gifts because the gifts could give them something to brag about. Gifts showed excellence. Paul now descends to their level. Very well, he says, you want to excel; if not to brag obnoxiously about your own superiority; at least you want to abound and enjoy God's favor. The motive is a good motive. Indeed, I tell you, seek to abound. However, the way to abound is connected with the edification of the Church. Hence with the edifica-

tion of the Church in view, of course you should seek to abound.

13-14 "Therefore he who speaks in a language, let him pray in order to translate. For if I pray in a language, my spirit prays, but my mind is unfruitful."

Here begin some difficulties, so that one must proceed carefully. One way of taking 14:13 is: Let him who speaks in tongues about justification or the atonement pray that God may next give him the ability to translate what he just said. That is, in addition to the message in tongues, the speaker must ask God for the meaning. This makes the prayer and the message different. The content of the prayer does not include the message of the atonement; the prayer is simply a petition for the ability to translate. Such an interpretation assumes that the person who had preached the Gospel in a foreign tongue might not have understood what he had been saying.

One cannot affirm that this is impossible, but it is highly improbable. Above (14:5), it was assumed that the speaker should as a matter of principle translate his message. Nor does 12:30 mean that the speaker ordinarily does not understand and needs another person with a different gift. When it says, all do not speak with tongues and all do not interpret, it does not preclude the possibility that all who speak in tongues also interpret. It says merely that some do neither. Hence 14:13 certainly does not have to mean that the speaker should pray for the additional gift of translation.

A better way to take the verse is to suppose the following background. The man has not given a message on the atonement. He has not petitioned God for the ability to translate it. What he did was to praise God in prayer, adore his incommunicable attributes, confess his sins, and praise Him for His grace. Now, why should he thus pray in a foreign language? The only reason that justifies such a prayer in the congregation is its subsequent translation. He makes the prayer for the purpose of translating it. "In order to translate" is a purpose clause. It is not the content of a petition.

This view does not imply that all speaking in tongues was prayer and none was preaching the Gospel. It does imply, however, that in Corinth much of such speaking was prayer and little, if any, was preaching to unbelievers. Nothing in the New Testament contradicts this supposition.

Further, it fits in better with the repetition of the verb to *pray* in the next verse. Verse 14 is a reason for verse 13. One should pray for the purpose of translating the prayer: "because if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays. . . ." Hence the verb *pray* must refer to the same prayer in both verses. It is a prayer of adoration, not a petition for the ability to translate.

Here now is the phrase that Pentecostals use to maintain that glossolalia are gibberish. "If I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays, but my mind is unfruitful." Not only do Pentecostals use this verse, but the Reformed Presbyterian committee interpreted the words as, "the gift does not involve the mind." However, the verse does not say this at all. It would be strange, paradoxical, incredible, that Paul, after having so stressed intelligibility, should now say that a foreign language does not involve the mind. What the verse actually says is that the mind is *unfruitful*. Unfruitful, but involved nevertheless. What Paul means is what he has already repeatedly affirmed; unless the message or prayer is translated, the work of the speaker's mind does not bear fruit in the edification of the assembly.

Furthermore, the verse said, "my spirit prays." However, the human spirit is the human mind. The peculiar psychology of Meyer and others who separate the mind or consciousness or person into numerous levels is reminiscent of Proclus' Neoplatonism, is destructive of the unity of personality, and is unbiblical. Spirit and mind are just two names for the same thing. If the mind were not involved, the spirit would not be praying. Go back to 2:11, "Who knows the [things or thoughts] of a man, except the spirit of the man which is in him?" This shows that it is the function of the *spirit* to know. No exotic, unintelligible, mystic trance of some supe-

rior faculty is in view. Then, also, 2:11 is speaking about the spirit of man. It is not the Holy Spirit, for He is immediately contrasted with the spirit of man. There is no escape from the conclusion that the man understands the prayer he makes!

Conversely, note well, that if the glossolalia were gibberish, it could not be translated, for gibberish has no meaning. If the mind of the man were not involved, no one could report what he meant, for he would not have meant anything. Intellectual content, understood (usually if not always by the speaker), is essential.

15 "What is it then? I shall pray with the spirit, but I shall also pray with the mind. I shall sing in the spirit, but I shall also sing with the mind."

This verse does not distinguish between spirit and mind as if a man could pray with the spirit without praying with his mind. Some Corinthians might have thought so, but Paul's point is that when one prays with, in, or by the spirit, one *ipso facto* prays with the mind involved.

Consider whether the mind is or is not engaged in the following instances:

Matthew 26:41: "The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak."

Mark 14:38: Ditto.

Luke 1:47: "My spirit has rejoiced in God my Saviour."

John 4:23-24: "Worship the Father in spirit and in truth . . . God is spirit. . . ."

Acts 17:16: "His spirit was provoked within him."

Acts 18:5: The better reading is *logō* (distressed in his reasoning), but the cursives have *pneumatī*.

Acts 18:25: "Fervent in spirit, speaking and teaching."

Acts 19:21: "Paul decided [purposed] in his spirit . . . to go to Jerusalem."

The reader may check out every other New Testament reference to the spirit, down to 1 Peter 3:6, which, I believe, is the last clear reference to the human spirit. Some refer-

ences, especially in the Gospels, and not included above, do not clearly imply an activity of the mind. However, none excludes it.

16-17 "Since if you bless in the spirit, the man who fills the place of the unlearned, how can he say the Amen upon your thanksgiving, since he does not know what you are saying? For you indeed make a good prayer of thanksgiving, but the other person is not edified."

Apparently the Corinthians, Gentiles though they were, followed the Jewish custom of saying Amen upon the conclusion of a public prayer. At least this was the custom in the synagogues, though in the Temple the formula was "Praise to the name of his lordly kingdom for ever and ever." Since many Christian churches were begun by preaching in the synagogue, and this was true in Corinth, it is not surprising that the Jewish custom should have been continued.

The two verses also indicate that the tongues phenomena in Corinth were mostly prayers, rather than preaching the Gospel to the heathen. For the rest, the verses simply continue to emphasize Paul's constant theme of rationality. The congregation is supposed to say "Amen," showing their approval of the prayer; but they cannot approve, if they do not understand the meaning.

18-19 "I thank God, I speak in tongues more than all of you; but in church I prefer to speak five words with my mind, in order to teach others also, than ten thousand words in a foreign language."

Five is a round number for a few. Luke 12:6 mentions five sparrows; Luke 12:52 has five in one house; Luke 14:19 has five yoke of oxen; and remember the five talents, the two groups of five virgins; and the five days of Acts 20:6 and 24:1, and so forth.

Presumably Paul is not asserting that he speaks in tongues more than all of them together, but rather, more than any one of them in the whole Corinthian church. Then comes another phrase that Pentecostalists use for their defense of

gibberish. If Paul prefers to speak five words with his mind, does it not follow that the ten thousand words are spoken without the mind's being involved? It might seem so, were not the context so uniformly contradictory of such a view. In keeping with the preceding, the better interpretation is that the mind, a divine endowment for learning and teaching, is unfruitful when the congregation does not understand.

Another point is that the Pentecostalists can hardly be pleased with Paul's preference for five rational words over the ten thousand they take to be gibberish. They assume that gibberish is the supreme achievement of the Christian life. Paul put tongues (not gibberish) on the lowest level. Gibberish is on no level at all.

20-22 "Brethren, do not be children in understanding, but be immature in evil, and be mature in understanding. In the Law it is written that by men of foreign languages and other lips I shall speak to this people, and even so they will not listen to me, says the Lord. Consequently the tongues are for a sign not to believers but to unbelievers, while prophecy is not [a sign] to unbelievers, but to believers."

The admonition that begins 14:20 suggests that because of tongues the Corinthians were indeed becoming children in understanding and mature in evil. So, once again—has not Paul already said it enough times?—the apostle stresses understanding. Indeed he says it twice in this verse. He must have known, and of course God who inspired him knew, that anti-intellectualism would plague the twentieth century. Let them who use the unscriptural distinction between the head and the heart and who stress emotions while they disparage the mind acknowledge that they are opposing Christianity. To them belongs the curse that Paul derives from the Old Testament. The curse of 14:21 and its application to the Corinthians make these verses somewhat difficult to understand. In Isaiah 28:11-12, the prophet had denounced the Jews of his day who refused to hear God in their mother tongue, Hebrew. Because of their refusal, God threatens to

speak to them in a foreign language. Even then, the Jews will neither listen nor obey. Paul freely quotes the LXX and uses the ancient situation as a warning to the Corinthians.

Someone may wonder how this could be a warning, or how even Isaiah could have applied it to his day. To be sure, it was wrong for the Israelites to ignore God's message in plain Hebrew; but how could anyone condemn them for paying no attention to a language they could not understand? Why did God choose to speak to them in a foreign tongue?

The objection is based on two misunderstandings. First, in accordance with the popular twentieth century notion that God is all love and no wrath, it assumes that God's message, even in a foreign language, was a straightforward message of salvation. However, if it be admitted that God can threaten punishment, the second misunderstanding is that the intellectual content of the foreign language was explicitly such a threat. In either case, the Jews could not have been expected to understand the words. However, the actual content of the foreign language was as a matter of fact whatever the Assyrians and Babylonians wanted to talk about. Some of this talk was the harsh commands as the heathen conquerors drove the Jews into captivity. However, this was God's message, none the less, and the Jews should have understood that God was punishing them for their disobedience and should have repented. "But even so they will not hear me."

Paul now draws an analogy between the Assyrian language, which the Jews could not understand, and the Corinthian tongues, which the Corinthians could not understand. What needs to be noted in the Corinthian passage is that a new paragraph with a change in the subject matter begins at 14:20. The first part of the chapter is addressed to those who spoke in tongues, and it regulates their conduct in the church services. That there is now a break and change is indicated by the address, "Brethren." Furthermore, the admonition to be mature in understanding, though it repeats a familiar idea, is expressed in a more general form and so indicates a new

application. Thus Paul is no longer directly concerned with the actual practice of speaking in tongues, but with the false evaluation which the Corinthians in general placed on the phenomenon, divine gift though it was. With this paragraph break in mind, the difficulty that gave rise to the objection above is dissipated.

There may remain some difficulty as to why Paul chose this incident in Isaiah for a warning to the Corinthians. Or, in reverse order, how can Paul's statement that tongues are a sign to unbelievers correspond to Isaiah, where they were not a sign to the Assyrians at all? In any comparison between the Assyrians and Jews, the former must be classified as unbelievers and the latter as the people of God.

However plausible this may be, it is a misunderstanding of the comparison. Isaiah is not comparing or contrasting the Jews with the Assyrians; he is comparing the believing Jews of earlier times with the unbelieving Jews as they went into captivity. To the believing Jews, of David's time for example, God spoke in Hebrew. To the unbelieving Jews, God spoke in Assyrian. The unbelievers here are Jews, not Assyrians.

Similarly, God spoke Greek to the Corinthian Christians at first; but now as they have deteriorated, have allowed serious corruptions to flourish in their midst, and are falling into unbelief, God speaks to them in foreign tongues they cannot understand.

This is not inconsistent with the fact that the tongues are a divine gift and can be a blessing. They can also be a divine curse. This happens when people become anti-intellectual, despise the conceptual message, and are conceited because they can spout Persian or possibly demonic gibberish. Hence it is that foreign languages are a sign to unbelievers. This ties in with the proper use of tongues also, as when the apostles on the day of Pentecost preached the Gospel to unbelievers in the languages of Elam and Mesopotamia.

One slight difficulty remains. The last verse says that prophecy is directed to believers and not to unbelievers.

However, examples of prophecies directed to heathen nations are found in Ezekiel 26:3; 27:3, 4; 28:2; 29:2, 3. In any case, the Gospel is to be preached to unbelievers. Paul's negative sentence, however, expresses the general rule, for most of the Old Testament is addressed to believers; and while we preach the Gospel, the whole counsel of God, all the prophecies, to unbelievers, most preaching is for the edification of the Christian congregation.

Though this quotation from Isaiah presents some difficulties, and though this commentary may therefore be mistaken in a point or two, one thing is unmistakably clear. These verses conclusively show that "tongues" are not gibberish, but natural foreign languages. In this case it was the Assyrian tongue.

23-25 "If therefore the whole church gathers in the same place and all speak in tongues, and there should enter some uninstructed persons or some unbelievers, will they not say you are mad? But if all prophesy, and an unbeliever or an uninstructed person comes in, he is convicted by all, he is examined by all, the secrets of his heart become evident, and so falling down in his face, he will worship God, declaring that truly God is in you."

This is in part the logical conclusion of the preceding verses, and the main thrust is that tongues in church services are useless and harmful. Picture the church assembled. Everybody who speaks at all speaks in a foreign language. In the congregation there is a Christian who does not understand Persian (*idiotes* refers to a believer; cf. verse 16 above), or there are some unbelievers (who also never took Persian in High School). What will their reaction be? "Will they not say you are mad?"

This indicates how far the Pentecostals of that day had declined from the phenomena at Pentecost. In Jerusalem, the unbelievers understood the tongues and were converted. In Corinth, no such result occurred.

In stark contrast, when a Christian prophesies or preaches in plain Greek, which everybody understands, the message of the Gospel, through the power of the Spirit, causes the unbe-

liever to repent of his sins: he falls on his face, and for the first time in his life, he worships God.

To propagate the Gospel, and extend Christ's kingdom, one must speak intelligibly.

26-40 Summary: Men are required to govern their speaking and to program the church services so that the meetings will be dignified and orderly. Women are not to speak at all. For God is not the author of confusion.

26-28 "What then, brethren? Whenever you assemble, each one has a psalm, a doctrine, a revelation, a tongue, an interpretation. Let everything be for edification. If someone speaks in a tongue, by two or at the most three, and in succession, and let one interpret; but if there be no interpreter, let him be silent in church, and let him speak to himself and to God."

These verses make a little clearer—what has been repeatedly referred to in the preceding verses—the great confusion in Corinthian church services. "Each one," in other words, nearly everybody wanted to talk, and they did so all at the same time. Edification was at a minimum.

Hodge surmises that the "psalm" was not a Psalm of David, but a composition specially prepared for the occasion. The Covenanters would not appreciate this suggestion.

Then come some directions: People are not to talk at the same time. They must speak in succession. Further, no more than three persons, preferably only two, shall be permitted to speak in a foreign language. Then let one interpret. The word is not *someone* (*tis*), but *one* (*heir*) of the two. Since it is possible, though unlikely, that the speaker cannot interpret, someone else may do so; but if there is no one to interpret, the person who wanted to speak in a foreign language must remain silent.

29-30 "Permit two or three prophets to speak; the others shall judge. But if [something] has been revealed to [another person] seated, let the first be quiet."

These two verses present several minor difficulties. It is clear, however, that no more than three prophets should

speak in one meeting, and they must speak in succession. One of the minor difficulties lies in adding three tongues-speakers and three prophets to make a limit of six speakers at any one service. However, if one of the tongues-speakers gives a prophecy, and not merely an ordinary hymn or prayer, does this reduce the number by one? At any rate, provision for six speakers is surely ample, and the Corinthians must have been quite disorderly to want more.

Another minor difficulty concerns the judgment passed upon a prophet by another person in the congregation. If by *judgment* were meant mere consideration of the message, there would be no difficulty; but if *judgment* means evaluation and therefore the possibility of condemnation, one wonders what right a member of the congregation would have to condemn a message from God. Meyer tries to avoid this difficulty by interpreting *hoi alloi* as "the other prophets." However, the wording of the verse barely allows of this possibility; and even so, the difficulty remains, for how could a prophet, especially a prophet as contrasted with an uninspired member, condemn a divine revelation.

Others would escape the difficulty by denying that these prophecies were divine revelations—they were merely sermons or sermonettes. This attempt to broaden the concept of prophecy to cover any exposition of the Gospel fails because 14:30 explicitly calls it a revelation, and a revelation made at the time and to the speaker. This verse cannot possibly mean that the person in question just happened to remember a passage in II Kings and wishes now to explain it.

Apparently, the best solution is to restrict the meaning of judgment and limit it to favorable judgment or to simple meditation. This makes perfectly good sense—just what the context requires; and it is better to weaken the word *judgment* than to extend and weaken the word *prophet*.

The next verse is also puzzling. Surely it cannot mean that if a revelation come to a seated member while another is prophesying, the speaker must stop and let the other prophet take over. Paul is trying to establish orderly procedures, and

this would hardly be orderly. For that matter, how would the speaker know that the seated member had just received a revelation? Would the latter get up, interrupt, and say, "Silence, it is my turn now!" Nevertheless this is precisely Meyer's interpretation; and the words seem to favor it. Hodge wants it to mean: Let the first be silent, become silent, stop speaking, before the second one begins.

Cowles follows Meyer and then adds, "Thus all whom the spirit might impress would have opportunity to speak. . . ." However, this reason is false because not more than three are to prophesy even though several others receive a revelation.

31 "For you can all prophesy one by one, in order that all may learn and all be encouraged."

This verse is the reason for the preceding and it seems to support Cowles, for his words closely parallel these. However, the limitation of no more than three in one meeting is indisputable. The present verse therefore must refer to a series of meetings—three at one meeting and another three the next evening. This fact disposes of the necessity for the first speaker to stop in the middle of a sentence so that a second, a third, a fourth, and all of them could all speak on a given night.

Notice that the verse is a reason; it is not a purpose clause. Meyer and Cowles seem to think Paul said, Let the first stop immediately *in order that* you can all have your turn. Paul actually said, Let the first one become silent [i.e., finish before the second begins(?)] *because* you can all speak some other time. He wants to restrain those prophets who are too eager to speak. They can all speak one by one.

This passage, and particularly this verse, shows that prophecy was a frequent gift. It reminds us of Joel who foretold the phenomena of Pentecost and the apostolic age: "I will pour forth my Spirit . . . and your sons and daughters shall prophesy . . ." (Acts 2:17).

32-33 "and the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets; for God is not [a God] of disorder, but of peace."

These two verses continue the sentence and are a part of

the same reason. The argument is, apparently contrary to Corinthian practice, that God does not jerk a man to his feet and cause him to speak against his will. This would combine two evils: it would make the man's prophesying involuntary and it would make God a God of confusion. Some modern ecstatic utterances, well, literally, all ecstatic utterances, are ec-static, standing outside; in other words, the speaker is beside himself. This is not godly. God is a God of reason, his prophets are not insane.

The word *spirit* here should be compared with verses 12, 14, and 15. It cannot in any of these cases mean the Holy Spirit. Nor can it even mean "the divine influence under which the prophet spoke," as Hodge maintains. If this "divine influence" could be distinguished from the Holy Spirit, Himself, as is unlikely, still the Holy Spirit's act of influencing can hardly be subject to the human will of the prophet. The meaning must be, what Hodge denies, the *minds* of the prophets. Hodge is right, as was said above, in denying that "spirit" is a *part* of the mind superior to *understanding*. However, it is not necessary to accept the faulty psychology in order to adopt the identification of spirit with mind. The identification, rather, precludes the faulty psychology. We must then understand the meaning of the verse in the most ordinary sense that the use of the mind in expressing a revelation is subject to voluntary control, "for God is not a God of confusion, but of peace."

34 "As in all the churches of the saints, let the women keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted to them to speak; but let them be subject, as also the law says."

The first problem here is one of punctuation. Recall that Greek MSS have no punctuation (except that long paragraphs come to an end); they do not even separate words by a space. Where then does the phrase "as in all the churches of the saints" go? KJ, NAS, many ancient expositors, Alford, and even Westcott and Hort make it the final modifier of verse 33. Meyer's American editor gives the reason against this connection: "So understood the words have no pertinent sense,

for the Apostle would hardly undertake to uphold a conceded and undeniable truth [i.e., that God is the God of peace] by appeal to the [doubtful] authority or experience of the church." We shall therefore connect the phrase with what follows.

The second point of punctuation is this: Does the phrase "of the saints" refer to the words that precede it or to those that follow? Since all churches are *ipso facto* churches of the saints, it seems unnecessary to say so. Then one would attach *tōn hagion* with *hai gunaikeis* and read: "the wives of the saints" are to keep quiet in church.

One might protest that all women, and not just the wives of the saints, are to keep still; and this would make the phrase "of the saints" as unnecessary in this phrase as it is in the preceding phrase. Now, this is true; and yet (1) the wives of the saints recognize the authority of the Church and are under greater obligation to obey than unregenerate visitors. Then (2) the unregenerate visitor, who comes out of curiosity or even with a serious interest, is not likely to speak out—even a man would hardly do so—and surely God did not give the gift of tongues or a prophetic message to unregenerate visitors. Hence, although the grammatical order of words favors the first interpretation, the second is not impossible.

With these punctuation points out of the way, the substance of the verses is the appeal to the uniform behavior of all congregations except Corinth: only in Corinth do women speak or prophesy in the service. Corinth, therefore, is disorderly and must correct itself. Women simply must not be allowed to talk in church. Paul does not base his command on the uniform practice of all the churches, though this would have weight enough. The practice of a single church would not be normative for others; in fact this whole epistle condemns practices of this single church. However, if all the churches, founded only a few years before by the apostles, uniformly do certain things, it is at least highly likely that these practices were commanded or approved by the apostles.

Yet there is also another authority. It is the written law of God.

The Levitical law seems to contain no explicit prohibition of women speaking. However, Paul deduces this consequence from (1) the provisions of the law which put all the conduct of the service in the hands of men, and (2) the general principle of Genesis 3:16, "Your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you." As Christ deduced the doctrine of life beyond the grave from the mere expression "The God of Abraham," so too, may we try to apply deductive logic to the Scripture and hope to discover many truths hitherto unsuspected. The great fault of contemporary American so-called Evangelicals is not an overemphasis on reason, but a woeful lack of it.

"Women's Lib" is therefore illogical; or if logical, it deduces its murderous atrocities from anti-scriptural principles.

35 "But if they wish to learn something, let them ask their husbands at home, for it is shameful to a woman to speak in church."

Some groups claiming to be evangelical, such as the *Association for the Advancement of Christian Scholarship* (based in Toronto) and other so-called Christian groups that work with college students, reject this scriptural principle on the ground that it was "culturally conditioned." This phrase means that Paul was speaking under the limitations of his first century culture and that therefore, his recommendations do not apply today. For example, in a booklet entitled *Understanding the Scriptures*, A. H. DeGraaff and C. G. Seerveld give their views. Almost at the beginning (page two in fact), Dr. De Graaff says, "You distort the Scriptures when you read them as a collection of objective statements about God and man. . . . They do not contain any rational, general, theological statements about God and his creation. . . . It is not the purpose of the Bible to inform us about the nature of God's being or his attributes" (p. 9). He also adds, "The Scriptures are neither rational nor irrational in character" (p. 18).

In my opinion, all of these statements except the last are false, and the last is nonsense. The assertion that the Scriptures contain no rational, general, theological statements about God and His creation is clearly false because the Scriptures say that God is righteous and man is sinful. To say that the Scriptures are neither rational nor irrational is nonsense. Everyone knows that the statement, Today is Friday, is rational. Similarly, Wellington defeated Napoleon. These statements can be understood, easily understood. On the other hand, the profound pronouncement, Onts skom bubbits, is irrational. There is nothing in it to be understood. It has no meaning. However, what example can be given of a sentence that is neither rational nor irrational, a sentence that has a meaning and equally has no meaning, a sentence that cannot be understood and at the same time can be understood? looking for one in a book, such as the Bible, is like going to the zoo to find an animal that is neither vertebrate nor invertebrate.

With respect to scriptural commandments, not merely the one about women speaking in the church, and not merely the several others in this epistle, but with respect to the Ten Commandments themselves, Dr. DeGraaff says, "None of them can be literally followed or applied today, for we live in a different period of history in a different culture" (p. 35).

Imagine! It is impossible to follow or apply the commandment, Thou shalt not steal, because we live in a different culture. Thou shalt not commit adultery, cannot be literally obeyed today because God commanded it in 1500 B.C. This line of thought is incredible. However, check the references: p. 35, *Understanding the Scriptures*, De Graaff and Seerveld, Association for the Advancement of Christian Scholarship, Toronto, Canada. Since none of the Ten Commandments can be literally applied today, Dr. De Graaff suggests that for them, we substitute agitation against police brutality (p. 36). Love your neighbor's wife, but hate the police.

In contrast with such modern movements, and given by

the Holy Spirit to condemn them in advance, Scripture says, "All Scripture . . . is profitable for doctrine . . . for correction, for instruction in righteousness." This includes the principle that women should not preach.

This is not all the Scripture says about women; and to console and encourage devout mothers in Israel who may be troubled by stating Paul's command so bluntly, let it be noted that Scripture also commands husbands to love their wives and to die for them as Christ died for the Church.

36 "Or did the word of God come forth from you, or did it come to you alone?"

Paul can be very sarcastic. The only justification for women's speaking in church is that the Corinthians invented and therefore can define the Gospel. This is not the case, and the Corinthians are arrogant to proceed on such an assumption. So were Mary Baker Eddy, Ellen G. White, and Aimee Semple McPherson.

37 "If any thinks he is a prophet or spiritual, let him recognize that what I write to you is a commandment of the Lord."

Here is the crushing blow to those who reject any of Paul's instructions on the ground that they are culturally conditioned. What Paul has said, regarding tongues, regarding incest, regarding women, and everything else, is a commandment from the Lord—and the Toronto group, by rejecting these commandments, condemns itself as unspiritual.

38 "But if anyone be ignorant, let him remain ignorant."

There is a textual problem here. RSV and NAS follow the text of Aland. Their translation is, "If anyone does not recognize this, he is not recognized." Metzger, in his *Textual Commentary*, admits that the imperative is better attested than the indicative. Nevertheless, the version chose the indicative because "the imperative gives a less forceful meaning than *agnoetai*." It is rather the reverse that is the case. To say that a man who does not recognize the apostle's commands is not recognized in the churches does indeed make a pertinent

statement. On the other hand, it is forceful sarcasm to say, he has rejected clear authority; there is no further use discussing the matter; let him remain ignorant.

It is difficult, however, to arrive at an objective decision on what is more and what is less forceful. For that matter, why should anyone suppose that Paul was compelled to choose the more forceful statement? In view of such doubts, it is wise to accept the better textual evidence.

39-40 "Consequently, brethren, be zealous to prophesy, and do not forbid speaking in tongues. But let everything be done in good form and order."

Dean Stanley says that decency and edification are the only rubrics of the primitive church. This is clearly false, for Paul gives other directions in the pastoral epistles, and our Lord, Himself, laid down procedures for certain judicial cases. However, though edification is not the only rule, it is indeed, as Dean Stanley said, universally and perpetually authoritative.

1-19 Summary: After Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures, he rose on the third day, and more than 500 brethren, including myself, Paul, saw him. This event refutes those who deny that we too shall rise from the dead. If there were no resurrection, the Christian faith would be worthless.

1-2 "I make known to you, brethren, the Gospel which I preached to you, which also you received, in which also you are established, through which also you are saved, if you hold to the doctrine I preached to you, unless you believed in vain."

Paul's literary style was no ground for boasting. Here, the subject is "I," the verb is "make known," and its object is "the Gospel." One does not complain of the descriptive phrase "which I preached to you"; but the rest consists of five dangling clauses.

The first two verses indicate that Paul is going to repeat because it needs to be repeated, at least some part of the Gospel. He had previously preached it to the Corinthians. They had received it, they had received salvation through it, but now some trouble, to be identified in the next few verses, had developed, serious enough to raise the question whether they had originally believed in vain.

The reference to believing in vain is no objection to the perseverance of the saints. It is always possible and in large evangelistic movements, it is doubtless always actual that some are caught up in the emotionalism and make a profession without having Christian faith. They are counted as believers because God alone knows their hearts.

Aside from this common circumstance, which would clearly justify the reference to believing in vain, Meyer hap-

pily remarks that the verb "received" expresses the historical fact of the Corinthians' acceptance of the Gospel, "are established" shows their present faithfulness, "are saved" looks forward to the blessed consummation, and "hold" stresses the abiding condition of its attainment; while "unless in vain," regarded as a contrary to fact condition, actually "denotes the exaltation above every doubt in respect of the Messianic salvation." This confidence does not preclude some church members from maintaining even serious heresies.

The RSV has a slightly different translation than that given here. It reads, "Now I would remind you, brethren, in what terms I preached to you the gospel. . . ." Leon Morris (*in loc.*), without referring to the RSV sees a difficulty in this translation. He says, "The word-order is, 'by what word I preached the gospel to you if you hold fast,' and this poses some problems. . . . It would make Paul demand that they hold fast, not only to the gospel, but to the actual words in which he presented it." For one who believes in plenary and verbal inspiration, this is no problem or difficulty. In fact, it would be a welcome verse for further establishing the truth of the Bible and the inspiration of the words. However, the verse does not really say this. Professor Morris gives the correct translation; and the RSV is incorrect; but his criticism depends on the incorrect translation. Paul did not say "in what terms," or "by what words." The noun is singular. One can translate it as "by what word"; but this makes poor sense, as is clear if one corrects the RSV to "by what term." Hence the translation above seems better: "if you hold fast to the doctrine I preached to you." For the rest, Principal Morris is right in noting the awkwardness of the sentence.

3-4 "For I have transmitted to you, as of first importance, that which I also received, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he was raised the third day according to the Scriptures, . . ."

Here, Paul indicates a doctrine or a set of doctrines as absolutely indispensable to Christianity. These doctrines were

not invented by Paul, for he, too, had received them. From whom? Paul received from the Lord information concerning the Last Supper (Acts 11:23, above); he had not received the Gospel from man, but by revelation of Jesus Christ (Gal. 1:12). Hence, he was not dependent on those who were apostles before him, nor on the Jerusalem church.

The situation, however, is a bit more complicated than a quick reading of Galatians would suggest. First of all, even in his persecuting days, Paul had considerable knowledge about the death, and maybe the life, of Christ. He also knew, not only the Messianic claim, but the more serious claim to Deity as well. Otherwise, he would not have engaged in persecution. When Jesus met him, Jesus did not give him additional information. The important thing is that Jesus convinced him that the claim to Deity was true and that the resurrection had actually occurred. Paul probably received additional bits of information from Ananias in Damascus (Acts 9:19).

Whatever details Paul might have learned, either before or after his conversion, the revelation Jesus Christ gave him related to the truth and significance of those facts. What Paul meant by the Gospel was no list of uninterpreted events; the Gospel is the theology of those events, plus other matters of theology not so closely tied to any events (such as the doctrine of the Trinity and the form of church government).

Yet, if with some good commentators we wish to see some human transmission in 15:3, we may note that the preaching of the same Gospel by the Jerusalem apostles was a strong attestation to the Corinthians of its authenticity.

Christ's death was, of course, an occurrence that Paul had known almost as soon as it took place. "For our sins" is the theological interpretation of which Christ had convinced him. However, even this is not the Gospel: Paul must add "according to the Scriptures." So far is Paul from restricting the Gospel to some narrow "kerugma," or six points of a truncated statement of faith, that he appeals to the Scripture as a whole. The phrase is repeated below. It is not enough to

preach that Christ died (Pilate eventually died, too), nor that Christ died for our sins; we must preach that he died for our sins by satisfying the justice of the Father in a propitiatory sacrifice, and all else that the Scriptures give.

The next phrase refers to the burial of Christ. Some contemporary theologians, for example, Karl Barth, want to have a resurrection unconnected with any burial. The term *resurrection* (for them) is simply the best term the disciples happened to think of to describe their joy at coming to be deceived into thinking that Christ was alive. Thus Barth allows himself to insist that the resurrection was an actual historical event that took place in time and space, just once—for each person.

However, Paul insists that Jesus was put into a tomb, and *on the third day*, before any disciple had experienced the joy of believing what was not so, he was raised from the tomb. The mention of the tomb in the Gospels, Paul's statement that Jesus was buried, and now the specification of the *third day* prevents every honest exegete from assigning existential ideas to the disciples. Christ rose just once, the 16th of Nisan, not September 4, when John Jones accepted Christ as Saviour. Say if you wish that the disciples were deceived; but do not then try to deceive us by appearing to defend a resurrection from the tomb on one given day in history.

The verb *egēgertai* is perfect, not aorist. For purposes of rebuking neo-orthodoxy, the aorist, denoting a single act in past time, would have been more pointed. Yet the perfect does not deny such a past act; indeed it asserts it. However, it also reflects on the present condition that the past act produced. Christ was raised and is alive today.

5-7 "...and was seen by Cephas, then by the twelve; then he was seen by more than five hundred brethren at one time, of whom the most remain to the present moment, though some have fallen asleep; then he was seen by James, then by all the apostles."

Paul now gives the historical evidence that Christ actually

rose from the dead. The evidence consists of an appeal to a series of witnesses, rather clearly in the chronological order in which Christ appeared to them. The first two instances are recorded in the Gospels. The third, when Christ appeared to more than five hundred at one time, is not recorded. It may have happened in Jerusalem, but more probably in Galilee. Obviously, the Corinthians knew about it; and if some did not, they could with little trouble visit most of them and hear the witnesses report what they saw.

The fourth instance is that of James. Since the twelve have already been mentioned, and since the disciple, James, had been eclipsed in Paul's day by Jesus' brother, James, it is likely that the latter is meant here. It is also probable and at least possible that Jesus converted His brother by appearing to him, as He did later to Paul. Hence, it is not correct to say with some opponents of the Gospel that Jesus is not reported to have appeared to any unbelievers, and that, therefore, the accounts are suspect because they all come from persons who expected the resurrection. For that matter, the disciples did not expect the resurrection any more than the Pharisees did.

The fifth instance is an appearance to "all the apostles." This phrase includes the twelve, but it includes others also. The wording indicates that James is included. Acts 14:4, 14 calls Barnabas an apostle. II Corinthians 1:19, I Thessalonians 1:1, and II Thessalonians 1:1 fall just short of so classifying Silvanus and Timothy. At any rate, the word is more inclusive than "The Twelve," an expression Paul uses nowhere else.

With the four Gospels and Paul's epistles as documentation, the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the tomb, if it is not "the best authenticated event in the history of the world," as Hodge boldly claims, is the best authenticated event in ancient history. What, for example, is the evidence that Hannibal cut off the great part of Caius Flaminius' army near Lake Thrasymene? Livy, Book 22; but what else? What

evidence is there that a high tide damaged Caesar's fleet as he attempted to invade Britain? Caesar's *Gallie War*, Book 4; but what else?

A secular historian who accepts either of these two events, or any other in ancient history, can reject the resurrection, not by the usual methods of historical research, but only by the theological presupposition that God cannot raise the dead. However, "why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?"

At the same time, Christians should be on guard against making wild assertions concerning historiography and related matters. It is undoubtedly true that Jewish law accepted the testimony of two witnesses as conclusive in criminal cases, but the Old Testament, itself, refutes Hodge's obviously false statement that "all human laws assume that the testimony of two witnesses, when uncontradicted; and especially when confirmed by collateral evidence, produces such a conviction of the truth of the fact asserted as to justify even taking the life of a fellow-creature." Hodge, note carefully, does not say that collateral evidence is necessary. Even if there be collateral evidence, it is not true that it uniformly produces in the jurors a conviction of guilt. It is well known that the identification of criminals by eye witnesses is very poor evidence, and I doubt that Hodge knew all the laws of all the nations, even all the relevant laws, to make his world-wide assertion.

Further, if historical research could *prove* that Jesus actually rose (and in the writer's opinion, historical research never proves any event—cf. *Historiography: Secular and Religious*, Craig Press, 1971), still this would not *prove* the Deity of Christ (for Lazarus rose from the dead, too), nor the doctrine of justification by faith. Research never produces Christian faith: it is the gift of God (cf. Westminster Confession, I, 5). It is God who causes us to believe what the witnesses report.

8. "And last of all, as to an untimely birth, he was seen of me also."

The phrase "last of all" can hardly mean merely the last of this list of witnesses. In the historical matrix, it surely indicates the last of Christ's appearances to anyone.

Untimely birth usually means a miscarriage or abortion. This would suggest that Paul had been born (had seen Christ) too soon, when actually Paul was born (again) too late, some years after the other apostles. Perhaps the word can refer to a delayed birth as well as to a premature birth—both are untimely; but the lexicons give no such reference, and so it may be better to take it, as it was often used, as a term of contempt that one of Paul's enemies had used. Then, Paul repeats it and by doing so shows his humility.

9-11 "For I am the least of the apostles, who am not sufficient to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God. By the grace of God I am what I am, and his grace to me was not in vain, but I worked harder than all of them, yet not I, but the grace of God with me. So, whether I or they, thus we preach and thus you believed."

Paul's humility stems from his vivid memory of his persecuting days. Peter may have denied his Lord thrice, but Paul considered himself the most unworthy of all. This humility, however, does not detract from his authority, for God called him, not to be an ordinary believer, but to be the apostle to the Gentiles. He would have proved false to God; had he resigned his apostolic authority (cf. II Cor. 11:5, 12:11, and Gal. 2:6-9).

Paul did not change himself from unbeliever to believer by any exertion or act of free will on his part. His change was due solely to the grace of God. This grace was so powerful that Paul's labors were more abundant than—Meyer says—those of all the other apostles combined. This assertion can be doubted. There was a similar expression in 14:18, where Paul presumably did not speak in tongues more than all the Corinthians put together, but more than any one of them all. There is no conclusive proof for either interpretation; but if Paul labored harder than Peter, that is enough for the point

he is making. Yet, it was not Paul who worked, but the grace of God with him (cf. Phil. 2:13).

Two readings here have about equal MS support. One says, "the grace of God with me"; the other is, "the grace of God which was with me." Textual critics suggest that the latter emphasizes grace alone. However, it is as hard to see any shade of difference in meaning between them as it is to decide which reading is right.

The last verse ends with a final reference to the content of the Gospel. Critics almost unanimously acknowledge this passage to be the most important of all witnesses to what the original content of the Gospel was. This disposes of all attempts to find time for legendary accretions to some now unknown ideas that Jesus' immediate companions may have had. From the first, they preached Christ crucified and risen.

12-19 Summary: The resurrection of Christ guarantees the resurrection of the dead. Otherwise, our faith is false, the deceased have perished, and Christians are the most miserable of all men.

12 "If now Christ is preached that he was raised from the dead, how can some among you say that there is no resurrection of the dead?"

Since, as has just been asserted, the resurrection of Christ is an essential element of the Gospel, it is logically impossible for a professing Christian to deny the idea of a resurrection in general.

Who these Corinthian church members were that denied the resurrection of the body must remain uncertain. There are two possibilities, and either one or both may have been the case. First, some Sadducees may have been converted. They were poor prospects, both because of their theology and their political ambitions. However, God could as easily have converted a Sadducee as a Pharisee, so that such a person, or some "half-converted" person, would be found in the church, while retaining his earlier antagonism to the idea of a resurrection (Acts 23:7-8). Second, and more likely, it was

some Gentile member who retained the views of the mystery religions concerning the soul after death without a resurrection of the body (cf. Acts 17:32). One should not hastily identify these persons as Platonists, or Orphics, who thought the body is a tomb. Actually, this ascetic view is contrary to the main body of Greek philosophy. Both Epicureans and Stoics had a high regard for the body, since they were both materialistic; and so did Aristotle; but, as Acts says, they ridiculed the notion of a resurrection.

Paul, not addressing Stoics and Epicureans here as he did in Acts 17, but addressing professing Christians, begins this paragraph by strongly emphasizing the logical contradiction between their general denial of the possibility of a resurrection and the historical event of Christ's rising from the tomb.

13-14 "If there is no resurrection of the dead, neither has Christ been raised; and if Christ has not been raised, then our preaching is vain and your faith is vain also."

One is almost ashamed to write a commentary on these verses. No other language could make the meaning plainer.

15 "Further we are found to be false witnesses of God because we witnessed against God that he raised the Christ, whom he did not raise, if indeed the dead are not raised."

This verse, too, needs little comment. Obviously, Paul was a false witness, a witness against God, if the Christ, the Messiah, had not been raised. A Greek or Sadducean denial of the resurrection of the body implies that Christ was not raised.

16-17 "For if the dead are not raised, neither is Christ raised; and if Christ is not raised, your faith is in vain; you are still in your sins."

Repeating again with utter clarity the necessary connection between Christ's resurrection and the possibility of any resurrection, Paul draws the further inference that without a resurrection, the Christian faith is useless. If further there is indeed a righteous God, then men are still in their sins, and no other means of salvation are available for escape from divine punishment.

Undoubtedly, Paul wrote some things hard to understand; and there are degrees of difficulty. However, Protestantism has always said that the Scriptures are perspicuous and are not to be replaced by papal encyclicals. The latter are harder to understand than Paul. The Confession is right when it says, "Those things which are necessary to be known, believed, and observed, for salvation, are so clearly propounded and opened in some place of Scripture or other, that not only the learned, but the unlearned [and perverse Corinthians] in a due use of the ordinary means, may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them" (Westminster Confession, 17).

18-19 "Consequently also those fallen asleep in Christ have perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are more to be pitied than all [other] men."

A further logical consequence of the denial of a resurrection is that the Christians who have already died have perished. Their faith was vain, and they went in their sins to face the wrath of God.

Hence, both the living and the dead are in a pitiable condition. In fact, Christians are more to be pitied than all other men. The reason Christians would be more wretched than any other people, if there were no resurrection, is not that they would have no shield against the wrath of God. The Greek polytheists face the same judgment. Rather, Christians are more miserable because they endure persecution for their faith.

Was Paul speaking only of his Corinthian church, or do these words apply to twentieth century Christians also? We, at least we Christians who live in America or western Europe, do not suffer persecution. Are our lives then, granting that Christ did not rise, more miserable than the lives of others? Suppose too, as many now do, that there is no God, no righteous God, who punishes anybody. Suppose we simply cease to exist when we die. Are our lives actually more miserable?

One might think we are less miserable. Bertrand Russell

based his life on "unyielding despair." This hardly seems attractive. Is not a life based on false hope, if not known to be false, more comfortable than continual despair? Bertrand Russell despised delusions; he would be realistic and honest; he would be courageous as well. However, could he be happier? Would not the Christian be less miserable?

How then can Paul say that the Christian is more miserable? The only explanation that seems to hold up is that Paul was very alert to the persecutions that were about to engulf the Christians for the next 250 years; and that through the Spirit, he also referred to persecutions that would occur in later times. The happy fact that in some places in some ages Christians escape torture does not seem to weigh against the proposition that Christians as a group suffer more than any other group.

This assumes of course that Christ never rose from the tomb and that we, therefore, have hope in Christ in this life only. The word *only* needs a little attention. The order of words in Greek is: "if in the life this in Christ having hoped we are only. . . ." Though some commentators have tried to do so, it makes poor sense and is grammatically perverse to interpret the phrase as, "if we have hoped only in Christ and in nothing else, we are miserable." Equally unacceptable is, "If we are only 'hoppers' in Christ and are not 'actors' or something. . . ."

There are two other possibilities. One may make *only* modify the sentence as a whole: "Only if we hope in Christ . . . are we miserable." This hardly makes good sense. The best sense, a sense in conformity with the idea of resurrection, is "If in this life only we have hope, and have no hope or benefit in the life to come. . . ." The context, both in the preceding and in the following verses, contrasts this life and the life after death. It might have been clearer if *only* were placed immediately before *in this life*; as it is, we must take *in Christ we hope* as enclosed by the two emphatic positions in Greek style, the first and the last, where *in this life* and *only* are placed.

20-29 Summary: The resurrection comes in stages. First, Christ's resurrection negates the death we inherited from Adam. It also looks forward to the resurrection of believers at Christ's return. With death abolished, and all things in subjection to Christ, Christ will deliver up His kingdom to His Father, that God may be all in all.

20-22 "But as a matter of fact Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep. For since death came by a man, by a man also comes the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in the Christ all shall be made alive."

In the preceding verses, Paul has given the logical and disconcerting implications of the rejection of a resurrection. Here, the premise of that argument is rejected by an emphatic assertion that the Messiah was indeed raised from the dead. The disconcerting consequences are 'cancelled out' because God's decree established a necessary connection between Christ's resurrection and ours. As Adam was the representative of his race and so brought death to all men of natural birth, so Christ was the representative of His race and by His rising guaranteed theirs.

It is to be noted that Paul makes no mention of the resurrection of unbelievers. If this were the only passage in the New Testament concerning the resurrection, one might conclude that Paul, like a few Jewish rabbis, denied the resurrection of the wicked dead. Paul's account here of the future is extremely brief. One must not take silence as a denial. Future events predicted in other parts of the New Testament must be fitted in or around Paul's few details. These future

1. Someone wrote a book, so I am told, to show how often Paul used fallacious arguments. This verse might have provided an instance. To argue that "if Christ did not rise, we are most miserable; therefore if Christ did rise, we are not miserable" is the fallacy of denying the antecedent. In elementary logic courses the student is warned against it. But Paul is not guilty of this stupidity because his argument depends on and includes other premises. One premise, very briefly stated, is that Christ is the "first-fruits." If this be so, then, with other scriptural premises, we are the later fruits. Paul's argument is not a fallacy because it includes his view of the relation between Christ and Christ's people.

events must neither be denied, nor fitted in carelessly, for there are complications.

The death that Adam brought to all who descended from him by ordinary generation was a spiritual and not merely a physical death, as Leon Morris (*in loc.*) so clearly and consistently says. Unless one recognizes what is meant by death, strange interpretations will result. Adam's death was first and foremost a spiritual death, of which physical death was only a part. If now this is implicit in the phrase "in Adam all die," then it is necessary to insist, as is clearly even if difficultly, explained in Romans 5:12-21, that the resurrection Christ gives to those in Him is a spiritual as well as physical life. The spiritual life begins when one is raised to newness of life from the death of sin, as Paul says in Ephesians 2:5-6, "When we were dead in sins, God made us alive with Christ (by grace are you saved) and resurrected us with [him]." This spiritual resurrection must never be forgotten, even though the main thought of the passage is the physical resurrection of believers at the Parousia.

Meyer, however, wishes to divorce the bodily resurrection from spiritual salvation. Therefore, he limits the death Adam brought us to physical death (at least for this passage) and interprets it to say, "As all men died physically in Adam, all men, unbelievers as well as believers, will be raised by Christ. Now, while it is true that unbelievers will be raised, Meyer's restriction on Adam's death and the absence of all reference to unbelievers in the preceding argument make this interpretation quite implausible.

Even when Meyer appeals to the words of the following verse for confirmation, "each in his own rank," as if *each* included each and every human being, the remainder of the verse, as we shall see below, speaks only of "those who are Christ's."

There is another reason. The last verb of the section is not "shall be raised from the dead"; it is "shall be made alive," and this verb never has unbelievers as its subject.

One must, therefore, keep in mind that unbelievers do not at all come into view here. Paul is not denying that they will be raised, but he passes them over in silence. His purpose was to comfort and strengthen the Corinthian Christians and for this, the fate of unbelievers is irrelevant.

23-24 "But each in his own rank; Christ the first-fruits, then the Christians at his Parousia; then the end, when he hands over the kingdom to God the Father, when he has destroyed every principle and every authority and power."

The first of these two verses contains two ideas that must be kept separate. First, each one is resurrected in his own *tagma*. The word *tagma* occurs only here in the New Testament. It means rank. It does not mean chronological order. The rank can be in the form of a group or a troop: the hoplites or the Panzer division. Though not explicitly stated here, these rankings can be taken from 12:28: apostles, prophets, teachers, and so on. In addition to these rankings, the verse also indicates a chronological order. Christ was raised first, almost 2000 years ago. The resurrection of "those who are Christ's" is still future. It will occur at the Parousia. Then comes the end. The end of what? Since the "of what" is not stated, certainly not in the phrase itself, some commentators have said that *to telos* is in the "absolute construction," in other words, not qualified by any *what*, and therefore the absolute end. Such an explanation says more than the commentators really mean, for surely it is not the end of God or heaven. The *what* must be qualified. It could mean the end of the historical process. Since the context concerns the resurrection, the most plausible interpretation is that Paul means the end of the resurrection; but this faces the embarrassment that the resurrection of the wicked must come in somewhere. One cannot assert that the resurrection has ended until after the wicked are also raised. Meyer writes, "thereafter [after the resurrection of the Christians]—how soon, however, or how long after the Parousia is not said—sets in the last act of the resurrection, its close.

which, as is now self-evident, . . . applies to the non-Christians."

However, this is not entirely accurate. One must not forget that Paul makes no mention whatever of the wicked. His aim, as was said before was to comfort the Christians; his aim was not to explain all the details of the eschatological process. It is a very brief selection from that process. All that can logically be inferred from these verses is that the resurrection of the wicked must come after the resurrection of Christ and before the end. So far as this chapter is concerned, the resurrection of the wicked could occur before, at the same moment with, or a long time after the resurrection of the righteous. To decide where, one must try to fit into Paul's sparse details whatever is taught elsewhere in the New Testament. As for the present passage, one should note that since 2000 years intervene between Christ's resurrection and the resurrection of believers, it is quite possible that "the end" can come 1000 years later.

To some people, it seems strange or even suspicious that Paul would have passed over in silence what to them is a most important event. However, this is not the only passage in which Paul allows omissions. In I Thessalonians, Paul includes certain factors not mentioned in I Corinthians and omits there what is included here; more so in II Thessalonians. The events described in II Thessalonians 2 seem so important that one would think Paul could not have omitted them in the present passage, and indeed described them more fully. However, Paul limits himself to the immediate concerns of the Corinthians. Hence, Pauline eschatology is not to be restricted to the present epistle, nor must one refuse to insert events mentioned by other canonical authors.

Further, the return of Christ, or the Parousia, is not to be taken as a point in time. The English versions, by their use of the word *coming* suggest a point in time. So do titles, such as David Brown's *The Second Advent*. However, *Parousia* does not mean a point in time, and to take it so results in confu-

sion and exceedingly strained interpretations. A better translation would be *visit*. Liddell and Scott have: "presence," citing Sophocles' *Electra*, "we have no friends *present* to assist us." The same author and play use it for arrival, but it is especially used for the "visit of a royal or official personage," and they cite the Tebtunis Papyri, and a number of inscriptions. A commentary on Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* uses the verb *parousiazō*, "to be present."

Arndt and Gingrich, in addition to similar citations, add I Corinthians 16:17, where *presence* is better than *coming*; II Corinthians 10:10, "his bodily *presence* is weak"; and Philippians 2:12, where *presence* is contrasted with *absence*. There are, of course, cases where *coming* is a good translation, especially with reference, in later writers, to the incarnation. Note also that II Peter 1:16 uses *parousia* to refer to Christ's earthly life, during which the Transfiguration took place.

We shall, therefore, translate *parousia* as *presence* and consider it to be like a King's inspection tour of his territory. The visit might take a month or a year; or in Christ's case a thousand years. Many things can happen during the King's presence. Considering it as only a moment leads to endless exegetical difficulties.

Another point in this verse, not so important though worth noting, is that the verb *give* is present and the verb *destroy* is aorist (past). Hence, the temporal order of events is the reverse of their grammatical occurrence: Christ hands over the kingdom when or after He has destroyed every principality and every authority and power.

25 "For he must reign until he puts all enemies under his foot."

This verse is an echo of Psalm 110:1, which Christ exegeted in Matthew 22:44. Psalm 110:1 might seem to say that the Messiah reigns in heaven until the Father makes all the Messiah's enemies a footstool at Messiah's feet. Then after this, Christ leaves the Father's right hand and returns to

earth. This is essentially David Brown's view in his defense of postmillennianism.

However, the Psalm is puzzling. Its wording is, "Jehovah said to Adonai. . . ." In the LXX, *Jehovah* is translated *Kurios*, and in the New Testament, *Kurios* means Christ. This would make the Psalmist say, Christ said unto Christ, sit thou at my right hand. The explanation must be that the Trinitarian distinctions, though implied, are obscured in the Old Testament; and Paul gives the New Testament interpretation that Christ, Himself, not the Father, shall destroy all enemies, after His return, and deliver the kingdom to His Father.

This verse and the last, taken together, suggest that Christ's victory over His foes is not instantaneous. His reign takes time, and it seems that it is a time of war.

26 "The last enemy, death, is rendered powerless."

The present tense anticipates the future victory. Death is here personified, or perhaps Death is the name of a Satanic demon (cf. Rev. 20:14).

27 "For he put all things under his feet. But when he says that all things have been put under, clearly he is excepted who put all things under him."

As the previous verse echoed Psalm 110:1, so this verse quotes Psalm 8:6—an almost verbatim quotation of the LXX, Psalm 8:7. Some liberals delight in attacking verbal inspiration on the ground that many quotations in the New Testament are not verbatim. It never occurs to them that Paul, like any contemporary believer, can paraphrase, weave several verses together, or make slight verbal allusions without denying plenary and verbal inspiration. Furthermore, Paul was writing Greek, not Hebrew; and like us, he used—here at any rate—a translation to which the doctrine of inerrancy does not apply. Though the LXX is not inspired any more than KJ is, Paul by inspiration guarantees the truth of what he writes. By the Spirit, Paul, unlike modern believers, could add to and explain the Old Testament. One could charge Paul with error only if he used Hebrew and put quotation marks around the wrong words.

The real trouble here is the exegesis of the Psalm. In the Old Testament, it appears to refer to the human race as the crown of creation, but Paul applies the words to Christ. The same application occurs in Ephesians 1:22, Hebrews 2:8, and possibly 1 Peter 3:22. As Christ deduced life after death from the phrase "the God of Abraham," so here, Paul gives the inspired inference from the Psalm. Probably the connection is that Christ is the perfect man, and hence, to Him belong in superior measure the glory and majesty of sinless humanity.

There is another peculiarity about this verse. It implies that God, the Father, puts all things under the foot of Christ, and that this is the reason God is not included in the "all things." Together with what follows, there seems to be a subordination of the Son to the Father. Yet above in 12:25, with its reference to Psalm 110, it is Christ, Himself, and not the Father, who does the subjecting. The difficulty, as was previously explained, is resolved by the doctrine of the Trinity—with this addition: In the Psalm, the Trinitarian distinctions were obscured; in the New Testament, they are made explicit. However, in making them explicit, the New Testament at times attributes the work of one Person to another and conversely. As Jesus said, I can do nothing at all by myself; I can do only what I see the Father doing, for what the Father does, those are the things the Son similarly does. (This is not a verbatim quotation, though the Greek text lies open before me. Of course, I do not claim inspiration, but the paraphrase makes it clear that writers sometimes allude to and even use the words of the text without intending a complete verbatim quotation.)

The immediate purpose of 15:27 is to assure the Corinthians that death will be conquered. This verse is the reason for the preceding: death cannot escape destruction because the Son and the Father will put all things under His foot.

28 "And when he subjects all things to him, then the Son himself will be subjected to him who subjected all things, in order that God may be all things in all [Christians?]."

There are two problems here. First, one is again confronted with something that could be taken as a denial or a weakening of the full Deity of the Son; and second, one may wonder whether the final phrase teaches universal salvation.

The first problem has been attacked in many ways. Augustine tried to explain it as the subjection of the *human nature* of Christ. At best, this is inadequate. Some Nicene expositors, in their anxiety to defend the hardly yet established doctrine of the Trinity, resorted to the desperate expedient of interpreting "the Son" as the Church, His body, as in 12:12, where the word *Christ* means the Church.

There is, however, a better and an easier solution. It includes, but goes beyond, Augustine. The text says *the Son* will be subjected. It is not necessary to understand this term to mean the *Son of God* in Trinitarian strictness. Jesus often referred to Himself as the *Son of Man*. This title is not, as too often asserted in popular sermons, a designation of Christ's human nature. It is a designation of the Messiah in His mission. No doubt the Messiah-Mediator had to have a human nature, but the title refers to the Messiah and the task for which that Person was anointed (*Messiah* means anointed, the Greek of which is *Christ*). It was the divine plan that the Trinitarian Son should assume the Messianic function and culminate history by His victory over death. Then, after He shall have accomplished His function, the Messianic mission will cease, and God will be all in all. Obviously, the victory over death is not yet complete, and Paul writes to assure the Corinthians that the completion will come.

The second problem was that of universalism. Does the phrase "that God may be all things in all" mean that eventually somehow everybody will be saved?

It is conceivable that a conscientious universalist might express his view only in veiled hints, for fear of encouraging indifference and carelessness in place of love and obedience to God. Is this phrase such a veiled hint?

The negative answer is supported by two considerations,

the second of which is the more important. First, if the preceding interpretation of Christ's sacrifice is accepted, the universalist hint recedes farther into the background of obscurity. In a passage which does not even mention the resurrection of the wicked, the inference to their salvation from the fulfillment of the Messianic mission is too tenuous to be taken seriously. However, the second and conclusive point is that from the first, the Messianic mission did not include the salvation of the reprobate. God gave the Son a certain people, as John 17 repeats several times over; and Jesus came to save His people. When He died on the cross, He had no intention of saving everybody—for example, Judas and the earlier inhabitants of Sodom. Scripture, particularly Jesus Himself, speaks of hell, outer darkness, the fire that is not quenched, and says that this condition is everlasting. He said of Judas that it would have been better for him never to have been born. This could not have been said of Judas, had he been destined to ultimate salvation. Since Jesus saw His seed and *was satisfied* (Isa. 53:11), and since He *finished* the work the Father gave Him, and since the Lord has done *whatever* He pleased, both in heaven and on earth (Ps. 135:6), it follows that the Messianic mission did not include the salvation of every human individual. Worse, too, for the universalists is their further implication that Satan, too, on their view, must be included. The Bible knows nothing of this, and here, the paragraph ends, or almost. At any rate, the main material on the Parousia is completed.

Excursus on Eschatology

Hodge and many others, as an introduction to their arguments against premillennialism, deprecate it as an old Jewish prejudice. Hodge says (I Cor. 15:24), "the form which this doctrine has commonly assumed in ancient and modern times is only a modified Judaism, entirely at variance with the spirituality of the Gospel and with the teachings of the apostle in this chapter." These words give the impression that

Judaism had a unitary eschatological doctrine and was agreed on the matter of a millennial kingdom. These words also assert that this Jewish doctrine contradicts I Corinthians 15. From this, one infers that it was equally a misinterpretation of the Old Testament.

If anyone wishes to dig a little deeply into the argument, he ought to pay some attention to what Judaism taught, for there was no consensus from 250 B.C. to A.D. 500, such as Hodge seems to suggest. Of course, there are Jewish documents to which Hodge can appeal and, as they represent a good number of rabbis over some centuries, Hodge can well consider this sufficient. The main question is, however, were these rabbis uniformly mistaken in their interpretation of the Old Testament? Or, more specifically, does I Corinthians exclude all their views? The views are various and conflicting. Since they cannot all be right, some must have been misinterpretations of the Old Testament, but it is at least possible that others understood it correctly. One must distinguish between the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha on the one hand—and these were not consistent among themselves—and on the other hand, the rabbinical writings of the Tannaitic (the first two centuries of our era) and the Amoraic (250-500) periods, both of which showed some divergencies within themselves.

Eschatology covers many details. Let us begin with the question as to whether all men are to be raised from the dead, or only some men.

Pre-Christian Jewish literature identified the day of Messiah (the day of the Lord) with the future world (*olam haba*; Heb. *olam* is *aion* in Greek, *eon* or *age* in English). It was the absolute consummation of salvation and included the resurrection of the dead.

Post-Christian Judaism separated the day of Messiah from *olam haba*. The Messianic period is the end period of the present age. Therefore, the resurrection does not occur in the Messianic age, but at the beginning of the future world (the eternal state).

In the third century, the complete consummation was put in the Messianic age—a return to pre-Christian Judaism, and the righteous dead would be resurrected in the land of Israel.

The rabbis discussed the fate of unrighteous Jews, but they had little or nothing to say as to the resurrection of Gentile unbelievers. The views were many.

II Maccabees in the Apocrypha stresses the resurrection of those who died for Israel in the wars of liberation. There is nothing else in the Apocrypha. The Pseudepigrapha teach the resurrection of all men. For example: *Enoch* in some passages teaches a universal resurrection, but the martyrs and the righteous receive clearer mention. The *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* (c. 100 B.C.) refers to a universal resurrection. The *Psalter of Solomon* (also c. 100 B.C.) mentions only the resurrection of the righteous. *IV Ezra* (A.D. 100) has a universal resurrection, and the *Sibylline Oracles* also (c. A.D. 80).

The rabbinical literature (c. A.D. 50-200) holds to a universal resurrection, though Josephus says that the Pharisees denied the resurrection of the wicked. Later, some suggested an annihilation of the wicked. Some had two groups of wicked: one annihilated, the other punished forever. Later, only *righteous Israelites* were to be raised. After A.D. 200, the universal resurrection became more widely accepted, for the reason that the wicked would have to rise in order to be judged by God at the last day.

The resurrection, naturally, is only one point in eschatology, but it is established that there were divergent views on the matter, and one cannot talk simply of the Judaistic view.

Next, there come the still more complicated views on the relation of the present world with the day of the Lord and with the future world. It might be said by way of an introductory assumption that—although the Pharisees of Christ's day seriously misconstrued parts of the Old Testament—if the Jews found certain implications in the Old Testament, these should not offhand be rejected as all Jewish superstitions.

One should remember the possibility that some of these views might have been correct interpretations and that the New Testament confirms them. The Jewish scribes replied instantly and correctly when Herod asked them where the Messiah was to be born. Why could they not have had some correct ideas on eschatology also?

Concerning the relation between this world and the com-
View Page 122
ing ages, one must again distinguish the pre-Christian productions from the later rabbinical writings. From the former, Strack und Billerbeck (*Kommentar aus Talmud u. Midrasch*, Vol. IV, pp. 799-801) have fortunately collected a long series of phrases and have woven them together in an impressive statement of Jewish hopes. Resounding with Old Testament phraseology, a longer than usual quotation is worth the space.

The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha, like the Old Testament, contrast the glorious future with the painful present, in which the Israelites are untrue to God and oppressed by their enemies:

"In the end of days, when the time determined by God is fulfilled, when the oppression of the hostile world-powers threatens to annihilate Israel, the cry of the persecuted, the prayers of the righteous, and the pleas of the saints will be heard. God mobilizes his myriads of angels, strikes the earth with the word of his wrath, annihilates the heathen world-powers, and subjects for all eternity the sinners and unrighteous to the great judgment.

"The scattered remnants of the people of Israel gather in Jerusalem; and the city of God, including the temple, is rebuilt in eternal glory. The righteous rise from the sleep of death and a time of never-ending prosperity and blessing begins for the pious. . . . All men are then righteous and without sin. . . . The tree of life is planted in the holy place of God's temple and provides life to the elect and humble. God himself dwells in the midst of the pious, and all the world will know that he is Israel's Father and they are his children.

Then will the heathen also be converted and will pray to God in Jerusalem.

"He who brings about this radical change for the benefit of Israel is, in the texts cited, without exception, God. Nevertheless the cooperation of created instruments is not excluded. The prophet Elijah will restore the tribes of Israel. . . . The archangel Michael will bring in the future time of salvation—an idea that must have come from Dan. 12: 1. . . . In those pseudepigrapha that mention the Messiah, it is naturally he who brings in the future consummation (*Enoch* 85-90 is an exception). . . . Girded with power from God he shatters wicked rule, cleanses Jerusalem, and destroys the godless heathen by the word of his mouth. Then he gathers the holy people to reign over them in righteousness. . . . Neither horses nor horsemen, neither silver nor gold, nor the mass of the people is his hope; Jehovah, before whom he will arraign the heathen, is his King and his hope. . . . Himself sinless he can rule over a great people and make away with sinners by his mighty word."

Those who wish to reject all Jewish speculation as prejudice and superstition must take account of the assertion above that the Messiah is without sin. Granted, the phraseology from a dozen Jewish pre-Christian books—for example, *Judith*, *Simach*, *Tobit*, *II Maccabbees*, *Enoch*, *Jubilees*—may not in all points correctly exegete the Old Testament, but they are not hypocritical, Pharisaic distortions. Even the nationalistic language sounds much like Zechariah 8. In all, the echo of the Old Testament is loud and clear.

At the same time, it must be noted that, exuberant in their Messianism, their views are all restricted to this world. The Messianic age is the time of complete salvation; there is no hint of an age beyond. The only contrast is between the righteous Jews and the sinners somewhere in the background.

In the century before Christ, the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* offers a marked dualistic world view. There is a strong contrast between God in heaven and Satan on earth—

the air is his habitation (cf. Eph. 2:2). Satan's opposition to God is described in detail: he seduces men, stimulates rebellion against God, inspires the heathen against the Jews. At the end of time, God will make war against Satan, will redeem all men imprisoned by Satan, and will cast him into everlasting fire. At that time, the Messiah will appear.

If some of the previous citations were premillenarian or this-worldly, and if this makes modern premillenarianism a Jewish prejudice, here we have a Jewish amillenialism. It is to be sure this-worldly, too. The Messiah will pour out blessings on His people, Jerusalem will no longer be waste, war will cease, and the Jews will return. A scepter of righteousness will be extended to the Gentiles, and all who call on the name of the Lord will be saved. The Patriarchs will be resurrected first (cf. 1 Thess. 4:16), then all the dead, some to glory, some to shame and eternal fire. The righteous will rejoice in the New Jerusalem, and God will dwell in their midst forever.

Next is the book of *Enoch* (c. 100 B.C.). It contains a long figurative section and a chapter that is more literal. Between them, there is some difference.

In Palestine, the immortality of the soul was introduced from Hellenistic Judaism. At death, righteous souls go immediately to heaven, where they remain until the resurrection. The Messiah then appears on earth with the heavenly congregation of the righteous dead to bring salvation to Israel. After Israel returns to its land and after the resurrection of the dead, the Messiah completes the judgment of all the godless. Evil is banished; heaven and earth are changed; and the blessing continues forever.

Since the righteous dead experience heavenly blessings during the intermediate state, they can hardly be "demoted" by their return to earth. The earth must be changed; and this feature gives the Messianic age a thoroughly supernatural character. It is, therefore, no longer the present age. Its world-order is new. There are, therefore, two cons, not three. No con comes after the day of the Lord.

The nonfigurative portion of *Enoch* (chap. 71) shows some differences. At the beginning of the Christian era, the opinion was introduced that the completion of salvation takes place in heaven, not on earth. This view was aided by the idea of immortality. Why should the righteous dead, already in heaven, return to earth? This would indeed be a demotion. Here is a complete break with the earthly, nationalistic eschatology of the old synagogue. The Slavic *Enoch* and the *Assumption of Moses* also assert that there is no earthly Messianic kingdom. The contrast now is not between two ages on earth, but between this world and the next. The second age is an "endless age," where there will be neither months, nor days, nor hours.

The nationalistic hopes, however, were so strong that compromises had to be sought. Thus, the Syrian *Apocalypse of Baruch* (c. A.D. 80) says that the Messiah will destroy Rome. Then, He will judge all people. Those who treated the Jews well, He will allow to live; the others He will put to the sword. Then, He will sit on His eternal throne. The resurrection comes after the Messianic judgment on Rome and before the world to come. The final judgment comes after the resurrection, and the Messiah returns to heaven when His intermediate age is ended. In this compromise, the nationalism is lowered to the status of an intermediate period. This cannot form a great contrast with the *present* world, but is really a part or conclusion of it.

IV Ezra has two cons. The present or first con is to pass away; it is corruptible, sad, and sinful. At the determined time, the Son of God, son of David, the Messiah, will appear, with all who are His, to redeem creation. At His coming, the nations will stop fighting against each other and join to fight Him. He will crush them by His word. He will even judge Rome. Then, the ten tribes will gather from exile and return to Palestine, where the Messiah will show them great wonders. The first wonder will be the New Jerusalem. The invisible, heavenly Jerusalem will descend to earth and will be

completely built on powerful foundations in great glory. The Messianic period will be 400 years. Then, the Messiah dies and all who have human breath. Then, for seven days the world changes into the silence of the primeval chaos. Then, the *eon* awakes, the second *eon*, the eternal future world. Sin and disorder are banished; unbelief is exterminated; righteousness and truth are ascendant. This new age begins with the resurrection and the world judgment. Sinners burn in hell and the righteous are blessed. It seems that the *place* of the new *eon* is the earth. Baruch had said heaven. The two agree that the main contrast is between this sinful age and the eternal age. Note the seven days of recreation, between the Messianic period and the eternal age.

The rabbinical literature before A.D. 70 hardly mentions two ages, or even the future world. Yet, the New Testament shows that the contrast was common from A.D. 30-50, and after A.D. 70, it appears in the rabbinical literature.

These writings agree mainly with *IV Ezra*. The Messianic period is not the consummation. The present sinful world continues until the resurrection and final judgment. Then comes the new *eon*, whose place is on earth near Jerusalem. One rabbi said that the Messianic period lasted 40 years, as did the wilderness journey. During this period, the land of Israel was regained through war and the defeat of the enemies. Rabbi Akiba, therefore, does not hesitate to call the age following the Messiah, the age of Old Testament consummation, simply *olam haba*.

The majority of rabbis from A.D. 70-200 do not merge the Messianic period with the end days of this age. The two are contrasted. The Messianic age fulfills the Old Testament Messianic prophecies and culminates in the establishment of God's rule on earth. As the kingdom of God on earth can have nothing in common with the kingdoms of this world, neither can there be anything common between the day of Messiah and the *olam hazek*. Still, the Messianic age is not the final and full consummation. The day of the Lord is neither

olam hazek (this world) nor *olam haba*. It is a period of time between the two. Such is the main view of the Tannaitic period (A.D. 70-200).

After the Tannaitic period, the Amoraic rabbis (250-500), who produced the two Talmuds, introduced two modifications. The first of these was a return to the view of Rabbi Akiba: the Messianic period belongs to this world. However, they lengthened its duration to 4000 years. There are, therefore, just two ages. The second modification also has two ages, but the second is both the age of the Messiah and the final *olam haba*. The Messianic age is identified with the final, eternal state.

One sees, therefore, that there was a variety of views among the rabbis. Some had three ages; some had two; and those who had two described them differently. In some, the Messianic times were on earth, some on a rejuvenated earth, and some not on earth at all. Differences have also been indicated with respect to the resurrection. Some rabbis held that all of the dead are to be raised; some said only the righteous will be raised; and some said the righteous and a part of the wicked dead will be raised, while the others will be annihilated.

Obviously, not all of these views can be right. However, it does not follow that they were all wrong. It is possible that even in one rabbi's interpretation, one part may be right while another part is wrong. Consequently, the premillennial view cannot be dismissed simply as a Jewish prejudice. One must study the Old Testament and decide whether or not all the rabbis were always mistaken; and one must exegese I Corinthians and determine whether Paul in chapter 15 definitely rules out a Messianic age. Meyer finds Messianic inferences frequently in I Corinthians. The present writer thinks he is several times mistaken, but the exegesis in this commentary will not conclude that Paul has ruled out the idea of a millennium.

The idea that Paul definitively rules out all notion of

millennium is the thesis of Geerhardus Vos in his *The Pauline Eschatology*. Vos faces the problem of relating Revelation 20 to the Pauline eschatology by introducing his views with strong prejudicial assumptions. He accuses the millennialists of "a reckless abuse of the fundamental principles of OT exegesis; a perversion invading inevitably the precincts of NT exegesis . . . a daring literalizing and concretizing of the substance of OT revelation . . . its long tortuous course," and other prejudicial language. More concretely, he objects to "the large mould of the Pauline eschatological teaching [being] reduced to the narrower, pictorial measures of the Apocalyptic vision" (p. 226).

In answer, one may say that the scope of the Apocalypse is as large and inclusive as Paul's. However pictorial many sections of the Apocalypse are, the whole is far from narrow. It begins with the first century churches in Asia Minor, then covers a certain amount of history, the details of which are admittedly difficult to identify, proceeds to the Parousia and the millennium, and concludes with heaven. This is as sweeping a scope as Paul's.

Vos thinks it narrow probably because it includes some details that Paul does not mention. However, even if the Apocalypse were not so large in its mould, and if it had only details, still these should not be set aside; they should be fitted into the briefer and more summary Pauline statement. After all, what is wrong with details? Paul omitted the "detail" of the resurrection of the wicked. Are we, therefore, compelled to disregard it? However, with respect to fitting in details, Vos finds it "difficult to escape the feeling that this is an unmethodical procedure"; but others cannot escape the feeling that it is the only proper methodology.

Further, while premillennialists, like people of other persuasions, have made mistakes, and some have made stupid mistakes, it is not helpful to reject premillennialism as such on the ground that it is a "reckless abuse of the fundamental principles of OT exegesis," "a naïve faith such a mentality

involves," and that the movement should be "psychologically studied" (p. 227). Could not one reply that a psychological study of the Dutch mentality might indicate prejudice in the opposite direction? Vos even complains that the term "chiliasm" is "unaptly chosen, because the duration of the interval . . . might have been six hundred, or four hundred. . . . Since, however, in common usage the number 'one thousand' is laid at the basis, the designation may be allowed to stand by reason of the preference of the vast majority of adherents . . . [even though it is a case of] prejudicially fixing the duration" (p. 228).

How sad that the Apostle John spoke so unaptly! Is it not strange that although the rabbis varied the Messianic age from 40 to 4000, Vos ignores the fact that the apostle by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit wrote one thousand? Vos allows the length of *one thousand* and the term *millennium* only because of "common usage" and "the preference of the vast majority of adherents" (p. 228); and repeats the charge of "prejudicially fixing the duration." Such a bias against John's *Revelation* is incredible!

In a less prejudiced vein, before the exegesis begins, Vos assumes that "Paul conceives of the present Christian state, ideally considered, as lived on so high a plane that nothing less nor lower than the absolute state of the eternal consummate kingdom appears as its worthy sequel. To represent it as followed by some intermediate condition . . . would be in the nature of an anticlimax" (pp. 235-236).

Two things need to be said about this assertion. First, in it, Vos denies the possibility of a millennium in the future. He does not hold that Paul is simply silent. He holds that Paul's words and thought definitely rule out all millennialism. This is the conclusion he aims at, and we must see whether his argument sustains this conclusion. The second point is that this assumption, that the Christian state is lived on such a high plane, still needs exegesis to sustain it. Even if the Christian life, *ideally considered*, is as glorious as Vos says,

I Corinthians, itself, shows how far below the ideal the actual is. Such actualities do not make a millennium an anticlimax. On the contrary, the millennium appears to be an entirely worthy conclusion to an earthly history. Even apart from exegesis, there could be divine purposes, either not revealed or only obscurely disclosed, that a millennium would serve. However, exegesis is the test. It is possible, indeed it occurs frequently enough, for prejudiced theologians to give excellent interpretations of many passages. The remarks here are intended only to warn the reader not to approach these passages with Vos' strong antipathies. Calling attention to these does not refute his views, but it renders them suspect. It also points out the deficiency of his methodology. However, the conclusive decision must be based on the grammatical possibilities of the text.

After giving a brief account of the several Jewish views, Vos begins his exegesis of I Corinthians and three other passages. He describes the millennial position thus: As in Adam all die, all men without exception are resurrected by Christ, including the wicked. Since 15:23 specifies only Christians, 15:24 must refer to the end of the resurrection process and, therefore, to a resurrection of the wicked a thousand years after His return. He also seems to imply that the millennial view necessitates construing *tagma* in a chronological sense (p. 237). This is not an unfair description of premillennialism. In fact, this excursus will conclude with an examination of the views of a scholar who holds just that.

Now, in this discussion, it is necessary, in order not to be overwhelmed by the details of many interpretations of many phrases, to distinguish three positions. Vos wants to prove that Paul denies all possibility of a millennium; the view Vos has just described aims to show that Paul teaches or implies that there is a millennium after which the wicked dead are resurrected; but the third view, and the one taken here and defended in the commentary, is that Paul's account is too brief to imply the one or the other. Both Vos and the pre-

millennialists he has described can make telling points against each other; but this is because they both press the text too far.

Vos is certainly correct, no matter whose view is different, that the phrase, "so in Christ shall all be made alive," does not primarily refer to the resurrection of the body. It refers to regeneration. Nonetheless, and this is what makes regeneration relevant to the Corinthian passage, the salvation that regeneration initiates certainly entails a bodily resurrection; but the possibility remains open (so far as this one passage is concerned) that since the wicked are not *made alive*, neither are they resurrected.

The commentary also gives a different interpretation of the word *tagma* from that which Vos ascribes to the premillennialists, and would deny that "since Christ in his resurrection *stands alone*, [he] cannot form a *tagma* by himself." Vos is undeniably correct when he says, "No plausible reason can be assigned why Paul should have written the clause 'Christ the first fruits' at all, unless he meant to assign to Christ a clearly defined place in the order of the resurrection" (p. 242).

However, these two points favor the first as little as the second; they favor the third, noncommittal position. This is particularly important because of Vos' conclusion: "If then *tagma* be given the sense of 'order,' 'rank,' and Christ comes in the first *tagma*, every necessity falls away for inferring from the mode of statement that there must be a further *tagma* beyond that of Christ and that of believers, and for finding here, in consequence of the other rendering, the doctrine of a twofold resurrection, one before and one after the millennium" (p. 243). This conclusion is literally correct: there is no necessary inference from I Corinthians alone that there must be a third *tagma* in the sense of a third resurrection event. However, this is not what Vos really means. This only means that the resurrection of the wicked is neither explicit nor implicit in I Corinthians. Vos, however, wants a

resurrection of the wicked and he does not want a millennium. However, neither of these two points follows *necessarily* from his argumentation.

Vos continues to describe his opponents: "The time elapsing between the resurrection of believers and the final resurrection must be a protracted period . . . [because] the first *hotan* [when] merely names in the Present Subjunctive the point of time when the final resurrection takes place . . . the second *hotan* names in the Aorist Subjunctive the period after which the resurrection will occur" (p. 237). That is to say, if I understand rightly, the moment when Christ hands over the kingdom to God is the moment of the resurrection of the wicked; and this occurs after He has abolished all powers, including death. Whether or not premillennialists have so argued, the view seems impossible because the abolishing of all powers is not complete before the resurrection of the wicked. The resurrection of the wicked cannot occur after He has abolished death. In this, Vos makes a point against those premillennarians who so teach, but he makes no advance toward proving his own position.

Similarly inconclusive are his remarks on the word *eita* in 15:24. He acknowledges (p. 243) that this word could have been used to indicate a long period between Christ's return and the end. However, he insists, and rightly, that the word is also appropriate if there be no protracted period. This perfectly correct observation, however, has no logical force for the conclusion that Paul denied a millennium.

A better attempt not to be inconclusive comes in his argument on the *hotan* in 15:24. The subject matter concerns the initial point of the Messianic age: Does the eschatological reign of Christ begin at the moment of His return, or did it begin at His resurrection in A.D. 30? If the latter, the "millennium" extends from that date onward to His return, then comes the end, and there will be no Messianic kingdom on earth subsequent to the resurrection of the saints. Vos writes, "While the words of the second *hotan* clause will fit either

view, nevertheless, when this clause is taken in connection with the statement of verse 26; it will be felt decidedly to favor an earlier beginning of the kingdom of Christ than at the Parousia" (p. 245).

This argument can be rephrased so that it will be seen to be formally valid. However, to prove the truth of a conclusion, not only must the argument be valid, the premises in addition must be true. One of Vos' premises is that 12:26 "will be felt decidedly to favor an earlier beginning." However, many people do not so feel; nor do they think it can be proved. Consider: "Then comes the end . . . When he destroyed all power . . . Death is the last enemy to be destroyed," therefore the "when" clause indicates the date A.D. 30. So far as these verses go, such an argument cannot be defended.

However, Vos has one more verse by which he will defend his view: "The last enemy that is brought to nought is Death. The conquering of the other enemies and consequently the reign of Christ consisting in this, precedes the conquest of Death. Now Paul makes the conquering of Death coincide with the parousia and the resurrection of believers. According to verses 50-58, when the dead are raised incorruptible, and the living are changed (i.e., according to v. 23 at the parousia). Death is swallowed up in victory" (p. 245). He also emphasizes the coincidence of the resurrection of believers with "the very last 'end'" and "the last trump" which excludes the prospect of any further crisis" (p. 246). This point will be considered below in the commentary at 15:52 ff.

After this harsh treatment of Vos, it may be well to balance the account by an examination of a premillennialist. Of course, there are many to choose from; but in a paper read before the Evangelical Theological Society in 1955, Robert D. Culver analyzed this Corinthian passage and took exception to Hodge; for which reasons, his paper is appropriate material here.

Culver wishes to defend the position that Paul definitely

implies the premillennial view in this passage. The present writer cannot agree and offers these following criticisms of his argument:

That the passage teaches a bodily resurrection, and that it does not teach universal salvation, we can agree upon. However, when Culver accuses Hodge of being motivated by "dogmatic interests . . . in excluding the unwelcome wicked dead from our passage," one must pause. Everybody has dogmatic interests. Culver, himself, displays dogmatic interests, for he is trying to establish premillenarianism; not less do the liberals who wish to discredit Paul. Dogmatic interests, however, are reprehensible only if no attempt is made to support the interests by exegesis—and Hodge exegetes.

Of course, Culver admits it. He says that Hodge's exegesis of the verb *zōopoieisthai* (*zōopoiethesontai*) "in a moral as well as a physical sense" depends on "grounds hardly tenable" (p. 29). However, Culver neither explains the untenability, nor cites any passage in which the verb is used of the wicked. A survey of the eleven occurrences of this verb in the New Testament will show that what is untenable is Culver's assertion. This survey will show beyond all doubt that the verb *make alive* does indeed have a moral as well as a physical sense, and it never refers to the wicked.

Ephesians 1:5 and 2:5 show that the verb *make alive* and even the verb *resurrect* can mean a spiritual resurrection from death in sin. However, whereas the verb *to raise* can refer to physical resurrection also, and thus can be used of the wicked dead, the verb *to make alive* is used only of Christians and is never used for their physical resurrection.

Next, consider John 5:21-29. The last two verses of this section explicitly refer to the resurrection of physical bodies out of the tomb. In fact, the verses include the resurrection of the wicked. However, the earlier verses, on which perhaps the later are based, can hardly refer to physical resurrection. Note: "As the Father raises the dead": this might seem like a physical resurrection, but since *raise* can mean regenerate, as

Ephesians makes clear, and since *dead* can mean *dead in sin*, one cannot determine which is meant here until the context has been studied.

The next verb in the context is *make alive*; and it occurs twice in this verse: "As the Father raises the dead and makes [them] alive, so also the Son makes alive whom he will." The phrase "whom he will" suggests that there are some whom the Son does not will to make alive. However, if a physical resurrection were meant, there could be no one who was not raised. Hence, the verse concerns spiritual resurrection from the death of sin.

Nor is such a notion foreign to the Scripture in general. Does not the valley of dry bones which were then clothed with flesh picture a spiritual resurrection? In fact, Scripture much more frequently calls the change from unbeliever to believer a *resurrection* than a *new birth*.

The main idea in John 5:21 ff. is the equality of the Father and the Son. It is part of Christ's claim to deity, "so that all should honor the Son as they honor the Father." This idea leads to a mention of *hearing* and *believing* the doctrine of the Son as the distinguishing mark of *eternal life*. The person who believes has been changed from death to life. The hour is now come when the *dead* shall hear, and those who hear shall live. For the Son has life in Himself and gives it to whom He will. Only after all this, is there a mention of a physical resurrection. It is an additional idea; it is not the subject matter of the preceding verses. These can only be understood as describing a spiritual change.

The linguistic usage, therefore, corroborates the interpretation here given of I Corinthians. The difference is that in John, spiritual life is the main idea and a physical resurrection is a minor addition, while in I Corinthians, the physical resurrection of Christians, without any mention of the wicked, is the main idea, and the reference to spiritual life is stated parenthetically as a reason why the resurrection must depend on a man.

Another instance of the verb *make alive* to show that it refers only to Christians and never to unbelievers in a physical sense is Romans 8:11, which says, "For if the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he who raised Christ from the dead *shall make alive* even your mortal bodies by his Spirit dwelling in you."

The mention of *mortal bodies*, in connection with the resurrection of Christ, gives the superficial reader the impression that the physical resurrection of believers is intended. However, the chapter is throughout concerned with the doctrine of sanctification. Physical resurrection is not envisaged, except as the resurrection of Jesus is used to illustrate the power of God, the Father. If now, the Spirit of the Father dwells in you, the Father by means of His Spirit shall so control even your mortal bodies, and not your mind only (cf. 8:6-7), that you may not be debtors to the flesh, but may mortify the deeds of the body, and may live. The whole context deals with our present life and not with a future resurrection.

Even if someone finds it hard to escape from earlier opinions, the verb *make alive* is applied here to Christians and obviously not to unbelievers.

Another instance of *make alive* is in Colossians 2:13, which also in the context refers to Christ's resurrection from the tomb. However, *make alive* obviously, indubitably, and emphatically refers only to Christians and their initial spiritual resurrection: "And you [the Colossian Christians] being dead in transgressions and the uncircumcision of your flesh, he made you alive with him, having forgiven us all transgressions."

For the benefit of those restricted to English, it may be said that I Timothy 6:13 does not contain the verb *make alive*, even though KJ might give such an impression. In any case, the context has nothing to do with a future resurrection of the wicked.

I Peter 3:18 is the only instance in the New Testament

where the verb possibly means a physical resurrection. It speaks of Christ as having died in the flesh and having been made alive in or by the Spirit. Since the verse cannot refer to any regeneration, it seems to refer to Christ's resurrection. Yet the idea of a resurrection does not fit very well into the context. At any rate, the verb is not here applied to the wicked dead.

There is one other reference of a physical animation. I Corinthians 15:36 speaks of a seed of wheat being sown in the ground, of its dying, and its being made alive as it grows in the spring. This is physical, no doubt, and it is an illustration of the resurrection; but it has nothing to do with the resurrection of the wicked. The picture or illustration is used in conjunction with the context, and the context concerns the righteous dead of the Corinthian believers.

This survey suffices to show that the verb *zōopoieō* can be used in a moral sense, and that what Culver said was untenable is the truth. It is Culver's position that is untenable.

Similarly, and in connection with this verb, Culver also objects to Hodge's interpretation of the word *all*. He writes, "*Apothnēskousin* is present indicative, describing an action going on continuously in the present. . . . This applies to physical death only." However, Culver does not mention that the death that came to Adam because of his sin was first of all a spiritual death, a death that indeed includes physical death, but only as a part of the whole death penalty. What Culver says is this: "*Pantes* (all) in Adam (v. 22) . . . is certainly the whole race. That the parallel *pantes* (all) in Christ (v. 22) are the same cannot be doubted. . . . The whole race in Adam dies; the whole race in Christ shall be made alive physically." What Culver seems to assume is that a passage referring to physical death cannot also refer to spiritual death, and conversely a passage on the physical resurrection cannot refer also to spiritual life.

Hodge exegetes, and his exegesis goes beyond I Corin-

thians. He cites two passages in Romans, John, II Corinthians, I Thessalonians, and the Gospels. What is not clear in one place is to be understood from other references that speak more clearly.

In addition to what seems to be Culver's mistake in reasoning (that Adam's spiritual death cannot be in view), and in addition to Hodge's appeal to other Pauline and New Testament writings, one cannot fail to notice that Paul's interest in I Corinthians centers in the distress of the Corinthian Christians. This is sufficient to explain some omissions a modern commentator wishes he had not made.

A last example of Culver's argument, and if some omissions are made, they do not affect what is included, is his discussion of the word *tagma*. After referring to Thayer's Lexicon, which translates *tagma* as a band, a troop, or class, Culver writes, "The word receives much more elaborated, but essentially the same treatment in the . . . Liddell and Scott Lexicon. Thus, it is clear that the word *tagma* does not mean position in a series, as in ranking honor students. . . . Rather a whole group, cohort, body, collection of men is here denoted by the word rendered "order."

However, Culver did not read Liddell and Scott carefully enough. This lexicon lists *order*, *rank*, *status*, and *function*. Of course, the word does not have to mean *rank*. It often means *cohort* or *troop*. However, it is false to claim that it cannot mean *rank*. Which of the two it means in any given passage depends on the context. Here, Christ is the first *tagma*. True enough the word *aparchē* is attached to Christ; but neither is the word *tagma* attached to Christians. Yet Christ and Christians both form the same enumeration: "Each in his own *tagma* . . ." *Tagma* at the beginning is attached to both Christ and Christians. Would not one suppose that what follows when *each* is enumerated is a list of the *tagmata*? "Each in his own *tagma*: Christ the firstling [for a sacrifice; in Rom. 11:16; it means a piece of dough; it can also mean a birth certificate, and Liddell and Scott suggest

this meaning for Rom. 8:23; in Koinē, the original sacrificial meaning has been eroded, and it means simply *first*], then Christians at his Parousia." If, now, this is a list or enumeration, and if Christ is not, Himself, a troop or cohort, it follows that *tagma* must mean rank.

The conclusion—that Paul neither affirms nor denies a millennium—displeases Hodge, Vos, Culver, and many others who think Paul surely must have said something about the millennium in this passage. However, no doctrine is fully explained in any single passage. Every passage is inconclusive on some point or other. The fact that a point of doctrine is true and is explicitly stated in one place does not imply that it is either explicitly or even implicitly taught in another. Ridiculous examples abound: the death of Judas is not found in James 4:13, nor justification by faith in Revelation 21:20. A more sober example is Romans 9:5. This verse may indeed teach the Deity of Christ, but it is far from being an extensive explanation of the Trinity. Hence it is neither an impossible nor a suspicious conclusion that the millennial problem is not solved in I Corinthians 15.

29-34 Summary: This is a sort of hortatory interlude before Paul resumes the main subject of the resurrection.

29 "Otherwise what shall they do who are baptized for the dead? If in general the dead are not raised, why are they baptized for the dead?"

It may not be absolutely necessary to acknowledge here that commentators are less than omniscient, but it is certainly appropriate. Meyer has five full pages of fine print on this verse, most of which can be summarized in a conclusion that no one has any idea of what the verse means. The Mormons can quote it with glee, but nobody else can.

The verse says that baptism for the dead is useless if there is no resurrection. So are all the dangers Christians run, as the next verse will say. This, of course, is the main thought: The Christian life is miserable if Christ has not been raised. The

introductory *otherwise* does not or need not refer back to 15:20, but is better construed with what immediately precedes: God is all in all; He is sovereign—otherwise, and so forth.

However, what "baptism for the dead" means, no one knows. Yet the practice must have been frequent and well enough known to justify this reference. Yet something is strange. Since, whatever it is, it seems contrary to the New Testament view of baptism and salvation in general, it is strange that Paul mentions it without condemnation. We would surmise that there was a condemnation because the practice passed out of existence, which it would not have done, had it been approved by the apostle. Nor can it well be said that the later Christians and ourselves are wrong in not continuing the practice, for there is no instruction in the New Testament as to its purpose. We would not know what we were doing. However, in the sacraments, we are obliged to understand our actions. This, then, is another instance of Paul's omitting something we would like to know.

30-31 "And why do we face danger every hour? I die every day, indeed by my boasting in you, brethren, which I do in Jesus our Lord."

Here is a further instance of the foolishness of a Christian life, if there be no resurrection. Paul and the Christians are in hourly peril of persecution. They, and especially Paul, are in danger of death. Why run such a risk, if there be no resurrection? In spite of many and serious flaws in the Corinthian church, Paul could boast about them, and with sufficient reason, too, for the boasting was in Jesus Christ, our Lord. The inference, to the credit of the Corinthians, is that they were willing to risk death themselves. However, this would have been foolish, if Christ had not been raised.

32 "If humanly I fought against wild beasts in Ephesus, what good is it to me? If the dead are not raised, Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die."

The key word here is *humanly* (*kata anthrōpon*). If he

fought without any view of God and the resurrection, his fighting would have been useless.

Commentators vary as to whether the "wild beasts" were literal lions and bears, or whether they were infuriated Ephesians. One can hardly identify them as the silversmiths because (1) in that uproar, Paul was relatively safe, and (2) the uproar occurred after I Corinthians was written. Yet, if the literal meaning is defended, other objections must be met. It may be said that as a Roman citizen Paul was exempt from such an ordeal. However, there is no guarantee that an infuriated mob (though not the mob of Demetrius) would be so careful of Roman legality. It is also argued that if a literal fight with animals in an arena had occurred, it would not have been omitted from an account, either in Acts or in II Corinthians, that included lesser dangers. Plausibly, but not certainly, for we have seen other omissions. One suggestion is to take the sentence as a contrary to fact condition: If I had fought even wild beasts, what good would it have been? This is grammatically possible, though the omission of the Greek particle *an* in the apodosis would be irregular, or at least infrequent.

At any rate the main idea is clear: The Christian life, especially its dangers, is useless if God does not raise the dead. If that were so, let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die. Some New Testament students are obsessed with the influence of Greek philosophy, positive or negative, on New Testament thought. Here, they see a reference to the Epicureans. However, Epicurus confounds the inaccuracies of these careless students. He wrote, "When we say then that pleasure is the end and aim, we do not mean the pleasures of the prodigal, or the pleasure of sensuality, as we are understood to do by some through ignorance, prejudice, or wilful misrepresentation. By pleasure, we mean the absence of pain from the body and trouble from the soul. It is not an unbroken succession of drinking bouts and of revelry, nor sexual love . . . it is sober reasoning . . . prudence, honor, and

justice. . . ." If one wishes to find Greek influence in Paul's statement, it is to the Cyrenaics that one must look. However, there is no need to postulate any Greek influence at all, for Paul's words come straight from Isaiah 22:13 and 56:12, written more than a century before there were any Greek philosophers at all, and four centuries before the Epicureans.

Even Meyer, usually so meticulous, speaks of this as Epicurean, but he betrays himself by finding its analogue in Euripides, who died a century before Epicurus was born.

There is also a question of punctuation in this verse. KJ makes it read: "If after the manner of men I have fought with wild beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not?" Meyer, Hodge, and the modern translations read: "If I fought . . . what good is that to me? If the dead are not raised, let us eat. . . ." This gives a smoother and more emphatic sentence structure. Maybe for once Paul avoided his preference for complicated sentences.

33-34 "Do not be deceived, evil conversation destroys good morals. Live righteously and do not sin; for some are ignorant of God. I say this to your shame."

Perhaps the first verse says more than "Bad company results in bad morals." The basic meaning of *homilia* is company, associations, or intercourse. However, it also comes to mean a sermon or a lecture. Inasmuch as the next verse by way of contrast speaks of ignorance, 15:33 can be taken as particularizing the action by which evil companions destroy morality. It is by bad doctrine. This fits very well into the context, for Paul is discussing the theory that there is no resurrection. This is bad theology; it is ignorance of God; and bad thoughts produce bad morals.

Hence, Paul concludes this hortatory interlude by urging the Corinthians to "awake to righteousness" (KJ). NAS does not give a literal translation, but says, "Become sober-minded as you ought." The most literal translation would be, "Become sober-minded righteously." This is awkward in English. Simply "Live righteously" is about as good a translation as any.

Righteous living requires knowledge. Note the reason given for the command not to sin: I command you "not to sin because some [of you Corinthians] are ignorant of God." There are theologians who sincerely wish to be orthodox and yet attack as a Platonic evil the proposition that the cause of immorality is ignorance. However, is this not a biblical principle? Ignorance causes sin; and as II Peter 1:3 says, *knowledge* is the means through which are given to us *all things* that pertain to life and godliness.

35-49 Summary: This paragraph goes deeper into the doctrine of the resurrection. Paul answers some objections to such a possibility. He describes the resurrection body as being much different from our present bodies. The perishable becomes imperishable, the dishonorable becomes honorable, the natural becomes spiritual, the earthly becomes heavenly.

35 "But some one will say, How are the dead raised? With what sort of body do they come?"

It may reasonably be inferred from this question—a single, not a double question, for the second only particularizes the first—and more so from the answer, that one of the objections to the resurrection, and perhaps the main one, was that the characteristics of our present life are not appropriate to a heavenly future. To answer this objection, Paul describes the resurrection body.

36 "Stupid! What you sow is not made alive unless it dies."

In Matthew 5:22, Jesus condemns anyone who calls his brother, "Fool!" "Whoever says to his brother, *Raca*, is in danger of the sanhedrin; and whoever says *Mōre*, is in danger of hell fire." There is at least no verbal violation of the warning; *Raca* is a hapaxlegomenon—it occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. It seems to be not only an uncomplimentary, but perhaps also a foul epithet. *Mōre*, or, in English, *Moron*, is the same in both languages. However, Jesus, Himself, in Luke 24:25, calls his disciples "mindless" (*anoētoi*). Though Jesus was disappointed in these disciples, He was not

viciously angry. Paul here uses another word, *aphrōn*, which can mean imprudent or unwise. In II Corinthians, it occurs five times. Jesus uses *mōros* in Matthew 7:26, 23:17, 19; 25:2, 3, 8, but these instances may be justified on the ground that Jesus knew the hearts of men and could legitimately apply the term.

The rest of the verse begins an analogy between the resurrection and the growth of a plant from a seed that has been buried in the earth. Our Lord uses the same illustration in John 12:24.

37-38 "And what you sow, you do not sow the body that will come to be, but a bare seed, perchance of wheat or one of the other [grains]. But God gives to it a body as he willed, and to each of the germs its own body."

The problem stated in 15:35 concerns the nature of the resurrection body. Involved are questions such as: Will our resurrection bodies be composed of atoms? Since, however, physics and chemistry are no longer based on the Empedoclean, Newtonian, and nineteenth century atomic theory, the question is not contemporary. If there is something that can be called "matter," it may be nonatomic, intangible "Energy." However, scientists today have no more knowledge of what Energy really is than Aristotle, who called matter "actually nothing," and Locke who described it as "something, I know not what."

Hence, one must be careful not to ask questions that are based on outmoded scientific theories—nor on science that soon will be outmoded.

A more important question concerns personal identity. As the new man in Christ must be the same person as the old man in Adam, for otherwise no person would be regenerated, so too, the resurrected person must be the same person who died, for otherwise no one would be resurrected—the man who died would never get to heaven. What now is this identical person? This is not only a question about the resurrection. If, when we died, we are made perfect in holiness and

do immediately pass into glory, what constitutes the identity of the person? It cannot be the body, for then the thief on the cross could not, himself, have been in Paradise with Christ that evening. Furthermore, our personal identity in this life cannot depend on the body, if, as is popularly said, our bodies change completely every seven years. At any rate, we eat more than 150 pounds of food in seven years. Then again, although some entombed bodies have been mummified so that the visible form is recognizable after 3000 years, other bodies have decomposed and have been dispersed in the ocean depths, still others have been cremated, and some have been devoured by wild beasts.

The question of personal identity is a serious and important question. It should not be shunted aside by anyone who wants to understand his own being. Augustine based personal identity, not in anything bodily, but in memory. Personality is not corporeal, but intellectual. I, today, am the same "I" I was yesterday because I remember. When God created Adam, he formed his body out of clay, then He breathed into that body the spirit of life. It is this spirit, not the clay, that is the image of God, and, therefore, the man, himself.

However, Paul was not discussing the image of God or personal identity. He was addressing Corinthians, Greeks, who generally had a great love for their athletic bodies. More particularly, he addressed himself to the apparently unanswerable question of the nature of the resurrection body. To answer it, he used the analogy of a seed.

Analogies have their difficulties. Christ's parables are the hardest parts of the Gospels to understand. Here, one may ask not only, Is the stalk of wheat the same entity as the seed from which it grew, but also, Did the seed really die? If it really died, could it have produced a new plant? Would it not simply decay in the sodden ground?

The difficulty arises by pressing analogies beyond their intention. Paul, in this passage, was not interested in a general theory of eschatology, nor is he immediately interested in

personal identity, and surely, he was not interested in botany. The analogy of the seed is as little detailed as his view of history, millennium, and resurrection. He contents himself first with the similarity between the burial of a Christian and the planting of a seed, and second, with the disparity between a small grain and the impressive stalk that grows out of it. However, press this further and the resurrection stalk is no more glorious than its earthly parent stalk that bore the seed to be sown.

Paul constructs a short simple analogy that is not to be pressed. His more literal and more easily understood statement is that God gives to each seed the body He had decreed, decided, or wished.

39-41 "Not all flesh is the same flesh, but one is of men, another flesh of domesticated animals, another flesh of birds, and another of fish. There are also heavenly bodies and earthly bodies. Nevertheless the glory of the heavenly bodies is other than that of the earthly. There is one glory of the sun and another glory of the moon, and another of the stars. Star differs from star in glory."

It is hard to see the purpose of these verses. There are indeed different kinds of flesh: lamb does not taste like beef, and pork tastes like neither. Furthermore, all these earthly bodies differ from the heavenly bodies, and these latter differ in glory among themselves. Because these differences are so many in number and so great in quality—the taste of lamb is so different from the light of the moon—one would suppose that the passage teaches that there are equally great differences among the bodies of the risen saints. Paul will shine like the sun, and the body of Luther will differ in glory from the body of Augustine. Since bodies are recognizably different now, not merely between cattle and men, but between individual men, one can easily expect some sort of differences among resurrection bodies. However, the difference between Polaris and Betelgeuse, and more so between a lamb and either of these stars, is so great that it is hard to understand

such a difference between Luther and Knox, or even Jennie Geddes. That God not only can, but plausibly does cause differences in our resurrection bodies, is easily understood; but what can be hinted at by these tremendous differences?

What perhaps interests us more is the difference between the present earthly body and the resurrection body of the same individual. The disciples could not, or did not, recognize the risen Lord either in Galilee or in Emmaus. How His body may have changed after the Ascension, we do not know. The Scriptures tell us that there is no marriage in heaven—we shall be like the angels. Should we then surmise that we do not eat three meals a day, that we have no sensations, and that we travel through space instantaneously? What can it mean that the resurrection body is as different from the earthly body as Betelgeuse is from a flashlight?

One would think that these tremendous differences hint at something, but the following verses, which presumably define the limits of the analogy, warn us not to push the illustration too far.

42-43 "So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in strength."

The words "so also" introduce the point of the analogy. The resurrection body is as superior to the body that is buried as Betelgeuse is from the flesh of a lamb. Nothing is said here about individual differences. The contrast is solely between the nature of our present physical bodies and that of our future resurrection bodies. The points of difference are these: The body that is buried is corruptible. In Aristotle's philosophy, all bodies below the sphere of the moon are subject to corruption. The modern view goes back before Aristotle and with Heraclitus holds that even bodies above the moon come into and pass out of existence. The entire universe is a world of flux. Change and decay in all around us. One cannot suppose that Paul was an Aristotelian, and

though he quoted Stoic poetry—the Stoics were disciples of Heraclitus—he probably gave no thought to the latter. However, no one can deny that the human body before death, and especially after death, is a corruptible body. In sharp contrast the resurrection body is incorruptible. Incorruptibility (*aphtharsia*) is then no doubt the source of the other qualities mentioned, namely, glory as opposed to dishonor, and strength as opposed to weakness. However, the more important contrast comes in the next verse:

44 "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual."

This translation, with the exception of one word, agrees with KJ. It is also the translation of NAS. The difficulty is that a literal translation of the adjective for *natural* makes poor sense in English. The adjective is *psychikon*, from *psychē* (soul). However, to say, "it is sown a soulish—surely not soulful—body," is not understandable. The word for *spiritual* causes no difficulty in translation; but both give rise to differing interpretations.

The adjective *psychikos* occurs six times in the New Testament: 1 Corinthians 2:14, three times in the present passage, James 3:15, and Jude 19, where it is translated *sensual*. The NAS has *natural* in James and adds *unspiritual* in the margin. The latter has no linguistic defense. In Jude, NAS has *worldly-minded*. This also is an interpretation and not a translation. The noun *psychē* occurs 105 times: 58 times translated *soul*, 40 times *life*, and a few times also *mind* and *heart*.

Psychē usually means the principle of life. Most Greek philosophers believed that the universe was a living being, and they therefore spoke of a world soul. Aristotle had an "active intellect" that came into man from without; but *soul* for him designated the nutritive soul for plants, the sensible soul for animals, and the rational soul for man. In the three cases, the soul was the form of the organic body.

Meyer understands Paul in a somewhat Aristotelian

sense. The body laid in the grave is, or has been, a body with the power of sensuous and perishable life. He supports this interpretation by an appeal to 15:50, where Paul speaks of flesh and blood. Hodge speaks similarly. The "natural" body, he says, is one "of which the *psychē*, or animal life, is the animating principle; . . . the same properties as those of the brutes . . . flesh and blood." However, why the rational function of man should be excluded from the *psychē* in 15:44 is not clear. It is a human body that is buried, and man is not just a sensory animal. Meyer's interpretation is all the more strange because he quotes with approval the remarks of Oecumenius and Theophylact that the soul possesses authority and supremacy (*to kuros kai tēn hegemonian*). This is surely more than sensation.

It would be better to interpret *natural body* as a body showing the deterioration of sin. To be sure, *flesh* rather than *soul* is the word that usually denotes our sinful nature; but, as we have seen, the word clearly has an evil connotation in James 3:15, and not less clearly in Jude 19. Furthermore, the main New Testament contrast between the present state and the future is the latter's sinlessness. True enough, incorruptibility is stressed throughout this section. Certainly up to this point, sin is not prominent, but along with incorruptibility, the moral and spiritual difference surfaces in verses 43, 50, and 56.

The second term of the contrast is the spiritual body. Now, if *natural* denoted the faculty of sensation, *spiritual* would have to mean rational. So indeed, Hodge explains it: "a spiritual body, *sōma pneumatikon*, is a body adapted to the *pneuma*, the rational, immortal principle of our nature . . . Spiritual in this connection does not mean ethereal . . . Nor does it mean animated by the Holy Spirit. But . . . the *sōma pneumatikon* is adapted to the *pneuma* or principle of rational life." Taken at face value, this means that in our present life, we have sensations but no reason. This means that the image of God, if man was indeed created

in God's image, was not merely depraved or defaced, but annihilated by the fall. It also wryly implies that Hodge, without a rational principle, cannot reason very well.

The best interpretation, therefore, seems to be that the spiritual body is a body such as the Holy Spirit designs to be suitable and competent for the functions of the future life. Incorruptibility is the characteristic emphasized here; but no one would claim that this is the only difference between our two states.

Excursus on the Revised Standard Version

William Childs Robinson in the *Southern Presbyterian Journal* (Vol. XI, No. 16) pointed out the RSV mistranslation of I Corinthians 15:44-46. This is a good place to repeat a part of Dr. Robinson's material and to add a few other instances of RSV mistranslations.

First, to quote Dr. Robinson: "The new advertisements for the Revised Standard Version describe it as 'certainly the most accurate' translation offered. In the notices the R.S.V. is contrasted with the King James Version made three hundred years ago, but little or nothing is said of the English Revision of 1881 or of the American Version of 1901—in both of which works the revisers had the benefit of the Westcott & Hort text—one which some of the New Testament revisers of 1946 have admitted using.

"Let us check the R.S.V. in a few New Testament passages. The last Nestle's Text, the one which the R.S.V. professes to use, gives, at John 1:18: 'God only begotten who is in the bosom of the Father.' R.S.V. translates, 'the only Son who is in the bosom of the Father,' and gives no marginal note to indicate that the other is the reading preferred by Nestle. On the other hand, both the English Revision of 1881 and the American Revised or Standard Edition of 1901 give, at least in the margin, 'many very ancient authorities read *God only begotten*.' Which is the more accurate?

"In First Corinthians there are several passages in which the Greek adjectives *psychical* and *spiritual* occur. The for-

mer of these adjectives is translated in the King James by the English word *natural*. This translation is followed by the 1901 translation, but with an added note in the margin under I Cor. 2:14 and I Cor. 15:44 stating that the Greek word translated *natural* is really *psychical*.

"In I Cor. 15:44-46 the R.S.V. translates the Greek adjective *psychical* by a different word for which there is a different Greek adjective, namely, by the word *physical*. This mistranslation occurs three times in these three verses. The cognate noun *soul* occurs in Verse 45 and is translated by the R.S.V. *being* in distinction from the translations of 1611, 1881, and 1901. By this mis-translation of *psychical* as *physical* the present body is given a material connotation; with the result that the contrasting adjective *spiritual* is read as implying that the resurrection body will not be physical or material but be a kind of ethereal or ghost body, or not a body at all but a spirit. When the Greek adjective is correctly read as a *psychical* or *psychological* or an *inanimate* or a *natural* body, it is seen that the Apostle is not describing the material or the composition of the body—but its controlling principle. Our present bodies are controlled by our fallen, Adamic psychology. In contrast the resurrection bodies will be Spiritual bodies, that is, bodies (real bodies) controlled by the Holy Spirit. In these verses Paul says nothing about the material or the composition of either the bodies that are buried or about the bodies that are raised. But the inaccuracies of the R.S.V. say much.

"Can the R.S.V. carry this mis-translation of *psychical* with its consequent mis-implication as to the meaning of *spiritual* through this one letter? By no means. The same two adjectives occur in I Cor. 2:14. If the R.S.V. translated there as in I Cor. 15:44 the verse would read: 'The *physical* man does not receive the gifts of the Spirit of God . . . because they are spiritually discerned. The *spiritual* man judges all things.' If I Cor. 2:14 were interpreted the way R.S.V. interprets I Cor. 15:44-46 it would mean that the unregenerate

man is a physical or material man, but that at his regeneration he ceases to be physical and becomes a man composed only of Spirit, that is, an angel. But the R.S.V. knows that the regenerate men still have physical weight and material substance, so they shy off their translation of I Cor. 15:44-46, and at I Cor. 2:14 translate the Greek adjective *psychical* not *physical* but *unspiritual*.

"The Greek adjective which is made to imply non-physical, non-substantial, non-material by the RSV mistranslation in I Cor. 15:44-46 occurs again in I Cor. 10:2-4. Here the adjective defines the manna which the Children of Israel ate in the wilderness and the water which they there drank. Was that food and drink non-substantial, non-physical, ethereal, ghost food? Certainly not. Consequently the RSV does not follow its implications of I Cor. 15:44-46 that the adjective *spiritual* means non-material. To avoid that implication they translated the Greek adjective *spiritual* by another word, namely, the word *supernatural*. This despite the fact that they read the same word as *spiritual* in Chapters 2:12-14-15."

There will now follow a short list of bad translations in the RSV. First, Acts 13:39 reads, "By him everyone that believes is freed from everything from which you could not be freed by the law of Moses." Instead of "freed," the KJ correctly has "justified." The RSV is not only a bad translation; it is a false statement. It gives the impression that we are freed from obeying the Ten Commandments, for these are included in the "everything" from which the law of Moses did not free us. This theory is called antinomianism and it encourages sinning. To justify means to free from the penalty of the law. It does not mean to free from the law's obligations. There is probably not a single lexicon in all the world that justifies the RSV translation. Of course, the RSV translators knew what the Greek word means; they also knew that the previous verse introduces the subject of the forgiveness of sins; and they also had the KJ translation before them. Why then did they choose to discredit the doctrine of justification?

Perhaps it was only a careless mistake, a very careless mistake; but the omission of the idea of propitiation from their New Testament can only be the result of a deliberate decision to alter the meaning of the Bible. In Romans 3:25, the KJ says that God set forth Christ to be a propitiation; I John 2:2 and 4:10, using a cognate word, say that Christ is a propitiation for our sins; Luke, using the verb, says, "God, be propitiated to me, a sinner"; Hebrews 2:17 says, "in order to propitiate [God with respect to] the sins of the people" (*sins* is not the direct object of the verb, but rather the accusative of specification, as the sense requires). The RSV has "be merciful" in Luke 18:13; "to make expiation" in Hebrews 2:17; "expiation" in I John 2:2 and 4:10; and in Romans 3:25, it is "expiation" also. Hebrews 9:5, the only other instance of these cognate words, is the literal mercy-seat in the tabernacle. Nowhere does the RSV use the word *propitiation*.

The meaning of propitiation is quite different from the meaning of expiation. The object of the verb *propitiate* is God—or, in human affairs, some offended party; the object of *expiate* is sin. One does not expiate God, nor can one propitiate sin. Hebrews 2:17 is the only instance where there is any semblance of "propitiating sin"; but as said above, this makes no sense, and there is no grammatical reason why the accusative *sins* cannot be the accusative of specification. To propitiate an offended party is to do something or other to turn aside his anger. To propitiate means to appease. Romans 1:18 talks about the wrath of God, as the Old Testament frequently does. The word occurs twelve times in Romans alone, and thirty-six times in the New Testament. In Romans 12:19, it refers to the wrath of a man; in 13:4-5, it is fairly evident that the ruler executes the wrath of God; in every other case in Romans, it is unmistakably the wrath of God.

The modern mind no doubt dislikes the idea of a God of wrath: God is all mercy and no justice. Liberal theologians reject the doctrine that Christ's death satisfied the justice of

His Father. However, they have no excuse for deliberately mistranslating these passages which most clearly assert the central doctrine of the Christian faith.

In the Commentary at 12:6, another mistranslation, apparently due to bad theology, was mentioned. The text of verses 6 and 11 actually says that God *works* or *produces* all the gifts in all the Christians who exhibit them. The two forms of the verb are *energon* and *energei*. In both instances, the RSV says "inspires." Since that is not what the word means, and since the KJ word *works* is not antiquated or obsolete, one infers that the translators, not one of whom believes in verbal inspiration, changed the meaning of the verse in order to extend the verb *inspire* over phenomena that were not instances of messages breathed out by God. Note that while some of these gifts may be cases of inspiration, others hardly require speaking at all. If anyone wishes to discover a different motivation behind this mistranslation, no one can deny that it is a deliberate mistranslation of the Greek text.

Also in I Corinthians, there is 1:30, perhaps to be classified as an unnecessarily lax paraphrase; 5:5, where the subject is wrong; 7:21 and 36, improbable interpretations; 14:5 wrongly identifies the interpreter; and 14:7, a good paraphrase, but not a translation.

Further in the New Testament, there is a lax view of what worship is, coupled with a bias against the Deity of Christ.

Nothing will be said here about the Old Testament, except to note the crime of conjectural emendation of Hebrew radicals without acknowledging that they have substituted other words.

Sometimes it is possible to force liberals to retract. The RSV New Testament appeared first in 1946. It had been widely heralded by an immense advertizing campaign. A million people impatiently awaited its appearance and turned eagerly to page one, the first chapter of Matthew, to see what the great new translation was like. There was nothing start-

ling on page one. A few years later, the Old Testament was finished and the complete Bible went on sale. Perhaps people looked at Genesis one, but few automatically open a complete Bible to Matthew one. When finally they turned to the first page of the New Testament, they found that a note had been added. On 1:16, it had, "Other ancient authorities read: Joseph, to whom was betrothed the virgin Mary, was the father of Jesus who is called Christ."

Let us first ask, why did these learned scholars add this note to the full Bible, when they had not put it on the first page of the New Testament edition?

However, there is another point. It is false that "other ancient authorities" so read. Just what an "authority" may be is perhaps somewhat elastic, but among the thousands of MSS, there is only one—and it is not a Greek MS—that reads as the note says. Let it be repeated, no Greek MS has the reading the RSV quotes.

Now, if you look in a more recent edition of the RSV, you will not see the note. The protests of believers forced the unbelievers to retract their note and thus to acknowledge tacitly the falsity of their assertion and the dishonesty of their scholarship.

45 "So also it is written, the first man Adam came to be a living soul. The last Adam [came] to [be] a life producing spirit."

English translations obscure the verbal connections here. The word translated *natural* in the preceding verse is here the word for *soul* (except only that the first is an adjective and this one is a noun). Paul had been contrasting the natural body with the spiritual body, and this in defense of the resurrection of believers. To support his assertions, in particular to establish the first part of his comparison, he quotes Genesis 2:7. The peculiar Greek (*egeneto eis*) is verbatim from the LXX, but the preposition, unnecessary both in English and in Greek, may have arisen by an attempt to preserve the Hebrew preposition *L* (*lamed*).

There is a further linguistic difficulty. In English today, and in New Testament Greek, the word *soul* denotes that part of the person which in contrast with the body survives death and is immediately united with Christ in heaven. This usage is found in Matthew 10:28, Acts 2:27, 31, II Corinthians 1:23, I Peter 2:11, 25, II Peter 2:8, and Revelation 20:4. There are other passages where the contrast between body and soul is not so clear; and there are some where soul can be interpreted to mean the whole person, body and soul. In the Old Testament, however, *soul* regularly means the whole person, the combination of body and spirit; and from one such passage, Paul quotes here: "Then the Lord God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath [i.e., spirit] of life, and man became a living soul." Thus the soul is not one of man's components, but the compound man, himself—body and spirit. This Old Testament passage is now used to support Paul's assertion, "There is [indeed] a body [suitable for the combination called] soul."

The second half of the verse is neither a part of the Old Testament quotation nor a deduction from it, but an apostolic assertion: the last Adam, Christ, came to be a life-producing spirit. Perhaps this phrase of apostolic inspiration can be taken as supporting what was said in the previous verse, "there is also a spiritual [body]."

Whether or not so taken, the time at which Christ became a life-producing spirit must be the resurrection. That is what the context demands. Not only the chapter as a whole, but the next verse in particular; and this next verse rules out Hodge's lame attempt to refer 15:45b to the incarnation. At the incarnation, Christ received a soul-body, as is clear from the vicissitudes of His earthly ministry. However, contrary to Hodge, His resurrection produced a change in His body.

The sense of the words "life-producing spirit" must also be found in the context. By His resurrection, Christ became the future resurrector of the saints. This is not to deny that

by His omnipotence He could have raised the dead without His having been incarnated and then, after His death, resurrected; but rather, in addition to the fact that according to God's predetermination of Christ's resurrection as a means to whatever should happen later, the resurrection of Christ is a guarantee that the "life-producing" spirit will also raise the dead.

For the more elementary student of the New Testament, one may point out that the comparison here between the first and the last Adam, in conjunction with 15:22, and, of course, Romans 5:12-21, is part of the basis for concluding that the first Adam was the official representative of all naturally born human beings, by which representation all these are held guilty of his first sin, and that Jesus was called the last Adam because He is the representative of His race, by which representation we stand before God clothed in His righteousness. The present verse does not say all this explicitly, but apart from the federal headship of Adam, this verse with its two Adams would be very hard to explain:

46 "But the spiritual was not first, but the natural, and then the spiritual."

Meyer and Hodge insist that since the word *body* does not occur here, Paul is stating a general law of development. Such an interpretation faces difficulties. First, the previous context concentrates on the resurrection of the body, and, therefore, the omission of the word *body* can be explained as merely Paul's preference to avoid redundancy. Second, the alleged general law is not completely general. The spirituality of the second Adam did not absolutely follow His "natural" nature. He was spirit before His incarnation. One must say that, as a general law, the spiritual, the infinite, the complete comes first in order to give rise to the incomplete being that then develops into its ideal state. However, Christ was not a spiritual *body* before His incarnation, or before His resurrection, either. Therefore, it is true and appropriate to say that the natural body is first in time and that the spiritual body comes afterward.

47 "The first man is of the ground, earthy; the second man is from heaven."

The first half of this verse causes no trouble: Adam's body was made of the dust of the ground. The second half has a complication. First, the TR on the authority of some good uncials and many cursives reads, "The second man is the Lord from heaven." This reading could suggest that Christ's human body at the incarnation was a heavenly body unlike Adam's. However, this meaning must be disallowed in the interest of Christ's actual humanity, in all points like as we are. A few more ancient MSS have it as translated above, and this makes easier sense. It refers not to the body as immediately dependent on the Virgin Mary, but to the resurrection body. In keeping with the interpretation of several verses above, whose sense was determined by the context, here, too, the resurrection must not be dropped from sight. The sentence is indeed condensed, but there is no better sense than the contrast between Adam's and our bodies as earthy and the resurrection body as heavenly.

48 "Such as is the earthy, so also are the earthy; and such as is the heavenly, so also are the heavenly."

This verse is not so difficult as it first appears. Yet one must notice that in each of its two parts, there is a singular and a plural. They are both masculine and cannot, therefore, refer to a body or bodies. The singular earthy is Adam; the plural are his descendants. The singular heavenly is Christ and the plural will be His resurrected saints.

49 "And as we bore the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."

Here is a most unusual textual problem. Nearly all MSS have the subjunctive rather than the indicative in the second half. The difference is between a long "o" as in omega, and a short "o" as in omicron. The long vowel subjunctive would be hortatory: "Let us bear the image of the heavenly." However, this does not fit the meaning of the passage. The whole is descriptive and didactic. Paul is describing the result to our

bodies of our future resurrection. To say, "Let us bear our resurrection bodies" makes no sense. Hence, we must accept the evidence of a very few MSS against the great majority. It goes against the grain, but for once, it must be done.

This concludes a paragraph in reply to the objection that a resurrection body is inconceivable. Now, Paul returns to complete an earlier line of thought.

50-58 Summary: Here, Paul resumes the eschatological theme of the earlier part of the chapter. Not all Christians will die. Those who happen to be alive when Christ returns will be changed without having to undergo corruption. Death will be swallowed up in the victory that God gives us through Jesus Christ, our Lord.

50 "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor does corruption inherit incorruption."

This concluding paragraph begins with another apostolic assertion, though essentially the same proposition was given before in 15:42-44.

Although the word *flesh* in the New Testament refers to our sinful nature, the phrase *flesh and blood* is always literal; or, if figurative, as in Matthew 16:17, at least without reference to sin (cf. Gal. 1:16, Eph. 6:12, and especially Heb. 2:14). This is borne out by the last half of the verse, because *corruption* does not mean sin, but susceptibility to physical decay. Paul is really saying that a corruptible incorruptible body is nonsense. He surely is not saying that a person who has had a corruptible body cannot later "inherit" an incorruptible body.

That there is any deep significance in Christ's statement, "Handle me and see, for a spirit does not have *flesh and bones* as you see me having" (Luke 24:39), is doubtful. The substitution of *bones* for *blood* does not seem to be profoundly significant, for bones are also corruptible; and if bones can be changed, so can blood. However, there remains a question of how the visible and tangible body compares with what Paul says in the next few verses.

51. "Behold, I tell you a secret: we shall not all die, but we shall all be changed."

The word *die* in this translation is, of course, *sleep* in Greek; and the word *secret* is *mystery*. Literal translation was abandoned here, not indeed to point out that *sleep* means *die*, but to emphasize that *mystery* means *secret*. Some people are attracted by what is spooky, ghostly, mysterious, and irrational. However, there is nothing spooky or unintelligible in this secret. Secrets are not usually unintelligible. Here, Paul's secret is simply that there will be some people who will not die.

Yet, to read all the queer interpretations given to this verse, one might almost suspect several ghosts in the closet. By a crabbedly literal insistence on the order of the Greek words, "all shall not die," one commentator wants Paul to mean that no Christian would die: All (1) shall not die; in other words, all shall live. Other commentators see here a belief on Paul's part that he will not die, but will live until Christ returns. This view satisfies liberals who wish to prove that Paul was mistaken and that the Bible is not infallibly inspired. Consonant with this is the idea that Paul is addressing the Corinthians (as he is), and that, therefore, the word *all* means all the Corinthians, but no others. This refusal to include all Christians of future ages—though how it goes with the first century Ephesians is hard to say—is relieved of utter absurdity by the denial of any future ages: the Parousia will occur before A.D. 60. There are also variant MS readings that have given rise to other peculiar interpretations.

The meaning, however, is perfectly clear. Paul says simply that not all Christians will have to die; some will be alive at Christ's return; but though they will not die, still flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom, and, therefore, they as well as those who shall have died will all be changed and made incorruptible.

52. "... in an indivisible moment, in the glance of an eye, at the last trumpet; for the trumpet will sound, and the

dead will be raised incorruptible, and we shall all be changed."

It is or should be unnecessary to note that none of this fits into any naturalistic or humanistic system of thought. Of course, none of the Bible does. History is controlled by the Sovereign Lord. Whatever laws it may have are teleological, not mechanical; and God produces events that Newtonian and Einsteinian physics find no room for.

What more concerns devout Christians is the series of events attending the Parousia. In the *Excursus on Eschatology*, a final point from Vos was left dangling. He had argued: The last enemy is death; the conquering of all other enemies, and consequently the reign of Christ, precedes the conquest of death; Paul makes this conquest coincide with the Parousia and the resurrection of believers; this occurs at the very last end, the last trump; and this excludes any further crisis.

Concerning this argument, several things should be said first, and then they should be supported by continuing the exegesis.

(1) Paul does not quite make the conquest of death coincide with the Parousia in the way Vos has in mind. For one thing, even Vos will admit that Christ's own resurrection is a part of this conquest, but A.D. 50 is not included in the Parousia. In the second place, although the complete conquest of death "coincides with" or better, occurs during the Parousia, it does not coincide with the resurrection of the righteous. Vos argues as if the Parousia were an instantaneous *Advent*, rather than a *royal tour*. However, since a tour takes time and is not instantaneous, the fact that the complete conquest occurs during the Parousia does not prove, as Vos claims, that the complete conquest occurs at the moment the saints are raised.

(2) Hence, "the end" does not necessarily refer to the very last end of everything. As for the last trump in particular, why must any trump at all be blown for the resurrection of the wicked? Vos, of course, believes that his argument is

logically conclusive, but the mere possibility that there is no trump at the end of the millennium shows that Vos' argument is fallacious.

On the matter of the trumpet, Meyer has a different view, which though possible, does not seem quite satisfactory. He says, "The last trumpet is *that sounding at the final moment of this age of the world*. It does not conflict with this statement, if we suppose that Paul conceived the second resurrection also (v. 24) to take place with trumpet-sound, for *eschatos* has its temporal reference in *aión houtos*." That is, the last trumpet of 1-Corinthians is the last trumpet of *this age*.

In addition, one may note that Paul's last trumpet here is not to be identified with the seventh or last trumpet of Revelation 8:6, but with the single trumpet of 1 Thessalonians 4:16.

(3) Turning now from the idea of the last trump, one further notes that Vos does not consider the fact that Paul's aim is to comfort the Corinthians. He nowhere mentions the wicked. Yet, Vos' argument presupposes that Paul in this passage dated the resurrection of the wicked at the instantaneous Advent of Christ. Thus Vos based his argument on a false premise.

These remarks complete the Excursus that was left unfinished. They are the alternative exegesis given in reply to Vos. A sort of appendix may now be added to fill in some details concerning the relation between 1-Corinthians 15 and Revelation 20. The amillennialists assert that Revelation is apocalyptic, highly figurative, and unclear. Paul is very literal and entirely clear. Now, responsible exegesis, they say, requires any unclear passages to be interpreted by those that are clear. This, of course, is true. However, what the amillennialists do not seem to notice is that what Revelation 20 says is far clearer than anything Paul does not say. Paul ignores the millennium, the resurrection of the wicked, and other eschatological events. Such events must be taken from Revelation and fitted into Paul's sketchy

outline. Or, better, Revelation and Paul should be fitted into each other.

Now, Revelation, for all its apocalyptic visions, is not so unintelligible as the amillennialists seem to think. With or without the assumption that Revelation 19 concerns the Parousia, Revelation 20 clearly says that Satan will be bound a thousand years. This is a perfectly clear assertion of a millennium. During this period of time, Satan cannot deceive the nations. This indicates a temporal sequence: Satan is first bound and later he is loosed. Note particularly that there is a period of time *after* the millennium, a period of time that the amillennialists must deny, since they deny the millennium to begin with. Even if they adjust their terminology and date the beginning of the millennium at A.D. 30, they have enormous difficulty in identifying a temporal period when Satan is bound followed by a period when Satan is loosed to deceive the nations once again.

The reference in Revelation 20 to this period of time is parenthetical, so that verses 4, 5, and 6 return to the millennium and assert twice over that the saints shall reign with Christ during the thousand years. Revelation 20:7-8 refer to the period after the millennium and describe Satan as again deceiving the nations until fire comes down from heaven and devours Satan and his supporters.

Undoubtedly, there are details in this account that are only partially revealed, and there are questions only partially answered, but it is clear, as clear as anything Paul said anywhere, that there is a sequence of periods of time; and this sequence is inconsistent with amillennialism.

53-54 "For this corruptible must put on incorruptibility, and this mortal must put on immortality. Now when this corruptible has put on incorruptibility and this mortal has put on immortality, then shall the word that was written come to pass, Death is swallowed up in victory."

The first of these verses is a repetition to introduce the second. The amillenarians no doubt insist that the resurrec-

tion of the righteous and the complete victory over death are simultaneous. However, even the grammar does not favor this view. When an aorist subjunctive depends on a main verb in the future indicative, the correct, but now somewhat stilted, translation is put in the future perfect: When this corruptible shall have put on incorruptibility . . . then the word shall come to pass." How long after is not indicated by the grammar, and when half of the future event is left out of view, one cannot say that the two points mentioned are simultaneous.

55 "Where, death, is thy victory? Where, death, is thy sting?"

This is not a misquotation of Isaiah 25:8 and Hosea 13:14, but an echo of their words, fitted together into a shout of triumph as the chapter approaches its conclusion.

56 "The sting of death is sin, and the power of sin is the law."

One might have expected Paul to write, The sting of sin is death. Sin like a scorpion has a stinger, and that stinger inflicts death. This, however, is essentially the meaning of the second phrase. It is the law that prescribes death as the penalty for sin. Were there no law, there could be no sin. Sin is lawlessness; where there is no law, sin is not imputed. The first phrase, therefore, ought to mean something at least slightly different. Could it mean that only sin makes death terrible, as one commentator says? However, such an interpretation implies that had Adam not sinned, he still would have died, though the idea and experience of death would not have been terrible. This seems inconsistent with Genesis. At least, the probation of Adam and the threat of death as the punishment for disobedience would seem to indicate that if Adam had passed the test, he would not have died.

Another commentator writes, "The sting of death is sin: that is, death would have no power to injure us if it were not for sin." However, this is the meaning of the second phrase, not the first. The gentleman gives two reasons for his inter-

pretation: "(1) Because if there were no sin, there would be no death." This statement is true, but it does not fit the phrase. "(2) Because sin gives death, when it has been introduced, all its terrors." However, this sounds as if death had first been "introduced," and then later sin made it terrible. This is backwards. Would it not be better to say, Death when introduced gave sin its terrors? Here is a verse to ponder:

57:58. "But grace [thanks] be to God who gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. Consequently, my brethren, be stable, immovable, abounding in the work of the Lord always, knowing that your toil is not empty in the Lord."

The triumphant conclusion, begun in 15:54, increased in 15:55, with a parenthesis in 15:56, comes to a crescendoing conclusion here.

It is wonderful, it is appropriate, and it is required that we praise God for guaranteeing our deliverance from death and corruption. However, at the moment, we live here in Corinth; our congregation is beset with serious troubles; and the powers of paganism surround us. Therefore, we should "mortify emotion" (*nekrosate pathos*, Col. 3:5), be steadfast and unchangeable, not erratic and scatterbrained; easily discouraged; and we should multiply our good works in the knowledge that the Lord will make them profitable.

1-12 Summary: Poverty among the Christians in Jerusalem requires the Corinthians to contribute aid. Paul not only draws up the orders for collecting the contributions, but also for their conveyance to Jerusalem. This involves Paul's travel plans, and in explaining his schedule, he also speaks of Timothy, who could visit Corinth, and Apollos who could not.

1. "Concerning the contribution for the saints, as I directed the churches of Galatia, so also you must do. On the first day of the week each of you by himself set aside and treasure whatever he may earn [or, whatever is earned] in order that then when I come there may be no collections."

This passage and others give the information that the saints in Jerusalem suffered from extreme poverty. Hodge remarks, "The poverty of the Christians in Jerusalem arose from the community of goods introduced among them at the beginning; an error which arose from an excess of love over knowledge. In thirty years [more accurately, twenty] that mistake may have produced its legitimate effects." Voluntary communism has always failed because, as Hodge continues, "Perfect equality in goods requires perfect freedom from selfishness and indolence." It also requires a high degree of economic understanding, a quality elected officials never have enough of. Calvin was right when he perceived that private capitalism is the economic system that the Bible approves.

In view of the poverty at Jerusalem (cf. Rom. 15:26), Paul had ordered the churches in Galatia also to make contributions, though it is not mentioned in that epistle. The contributions were no doubt voluntary, nevertheless Paul had ordered or commanded (*dietaxo*) it in Galatia and does so in Corinth as well (*poiësatē*, imperative).

Paul had not only ordered these contributions, he had directed the method to be used. Some commentators describe this method as saving money at home (*par' heautōi*, by himself), and then, says Meyer, "The collection was to be then so far already made, that everyone would only have to produce what he had already gathered together week by week out of his profits in trade." Surely this interpretation violates the specific injunction that no collections are to be made when Paul comes.

Hodge supports a better view. *Par' heautōi*, he says, does not mean at home, but simply by himself, in other words, let each take to himself what he intends to give. *Thēsaurizōn* does not mean "save at home." It means, "put into the treasury." This strongly suggests the common treasury of the congregation. Further, if the money were to be saved at home, there would be no point in mentioning the first day of the week. Setting aside money at home could best be done on whatever day the money was received. The mention of the first day makes sense only if Paul had in mind a church service on the Lord's Day. The passage is fatal to Seventh Day Adventism.

"Whatever he may earn" is a good enough translation, but it surely distorts Paul's meaning. Paul does not require the Corinthians to give all their earnings. It is legitimate to say, "as he has earned." If he has earned nothing, he is not required to give anything, for there is another word in the Greek phrase that is awkward in English: whatever *if* he has earned. The *if* can be a hint that perhaps someone has earned nothing. There were people here in America in the thirties, and today, and perhaps some at any time, who are out of work.

3-4 "When I am present, whomever you select, I shall send with letters to carry your favor to Jerusalem. And if it be good for me to go too, they shall accompany me."

The Corinthian church is to select its own representatives. Paul did not choose them. However, Paul sends them—they

go by apostolic authority. This authority is evidenced by letters. Paul would write several letters, no doubt to various persons in Jerusalem. The phrase, though it immediately follows the verb *select*, must be attached; not to the selecting process—that would make no sense—but to the sending.

However, letters may not be needed. If Paul considers it good or worthy, he will personally accompany the representatives to Jerusalem. Apparently, most commentators hold that the trip to Jerusalem would seem good to Paul, only if a large amount of money had been collected. It would be beneath apostolic dignity to accompany an insignificant contribution.

5 "I shall come to you when I pass through Macedonia, for I am passing through Macedonia. Perchance I shall stay with you or even spend the winter there in order that you may send me on wherever I may go. For I do not wish to see you right now on the run, for I hope to remain with you for some time, if the Lord allow."

Paul had considered other travel plans, but this is what he finally decided upon and carried out. His desire to stay several months in Corinth, though only a few days in Macedonia, testifies to his concern for the Corinthians and his intention to set some things straight in person (cf. II:34).

8-9 "But I shall stay in Ephesus until Pentecost, for a door great and effective has opened for me, and opponents are many."

However great Paul's concern for the Corinthians may have been, he could not just drop his work in Ephesus and run to them. He decided to spend the spring in Ephesus, use the summer to pass through Macedonia, and arrive in Corinth in the fall. The reason was that Ephesus presented him with an unusually promising opportunity. He could work there with great effect. Naturally, there were many enemies.

10-12 "If Timothy should come, see that he be without fear among you, for he does the Lord's work as I do. Accordingly, let no one despise him. Send him on in peace, that he

may come to me, for I shall receive him with the brethren. Concerning brother Apollos, I urged him many times to come to you with the brethren. But it was absolutely not his will to come now, but he will come when he finds time."

The plan for carrying the contributions to Jerusalem leads to the mention of Timothy and Apollos. Timothy will visit Corinth. Some too energetic businessmen may despise him because he is so young. This must not be allowed because Timothy is doing the Lord's work, and obviously very well. The Corinthians are then to send him on to Paul with some other brethren.

As for Apollos, Paul urged him also to visit Corinth, but he decided against it for the time being. He would come later. This reference to Apollos, Paul's urging him to go to Corinth, where some said, "I am of Apollos," shows how mistaken the liberal commentator was, when he said that Paul was jealous of Apollos.

13-24 Summary: The final exhortation; the work of some local pastors; greetings from Asia; Paul's own greeting; a warning and a benediction.

13-14 "Be alert, stand firm in the faith, be a man, be strong; let all your affairs proceed in love."

This is the final exhortation and the summary of all the previous instructions and precepts. The difficulties the Corinthians faced necessitated this apostolic advice.

15-18 "I urge you, brethren—you know the household of Stephanus, that it is the first fruits of Achaia, and [how] they set themselves to serve the saints—that you submit to such persons and to everyone who cooperates and works. I am glad for the presence of Stephanus, Fortunatus, and Achaicus because these men made up for your absence, for they have refreshed my spirit and yours. Therefore give recognition to such people."

Stephanus was the first convert in Achaia. Achaia is that part of Greece south of Macedonia, including all of the Peloponnesus, and some islands. Since Stephanus was the

first convert, he could not have been living in Corinth, for Athens had a few converts before Corinth. However, he must have shortly come to Corinth, where he served as a pastor perhaps, or in some prominent capacity. Apparently, a part of the Corinthian church did not like him, and Paul insists that they give him their respect. Yet he and two others were chosen as Corinthian delegates to visit Paul in Ephesus. The purpose of the visit was doubtless to discuss the troubles in Corinth and to bring Paul the letter mentioned in 7:1.

19-20 "The churches of Asia greet you. Aquila and Prisca, with the church that is in their home, greet you most cordially in the Lord. All the brethren greet you. Greet each other with a holy kiss."

The delegation from Corinth to Paul, Aquila's and Priscilla's travels from Rome to Corinth to Ephesus, show that some Christians at least were able to travel considerable distances even before the jet age. A peculiar triviality is that the Asian churches *greet* the Corinthians with a plural verb; Aquila and Priscilla with their church *greet* the Corinthians with a singular verb; and all the brethren revert to the plural.

21-24 "The greeting of Paul in my own hand. If anyone does not love the Lord, let him be anathema. Maranatha. The grace of the Lord Jesus be with you. My love be with you all in Christ Jesus. Amen."

According to II Thessalonians 3:17, Paul signed all his epistles, though he had a secretary write the main body of the letter (cf. Col. 4:18). However, not all his epistles end with the words, "I Paul by my own hand." One must suppose that he neglected this custom in Romans, II Corinthians, Ephesians, and others, or that without these words, he wrote the greetings of Romans 16:1-21, II Corinthians 13:12-14, and Ephesians 6:21-24 in his own recognizable handwriting.

Verse 22 is a curse. *Anathema* means "set aside for destruction." The curse is enforced by *Maranatha*, or, *Marana tha*. The former form of these Aramaic words means, "The Lord has come." The latter, with better sense, means, "Lord,

come!" In the first case, the past coming of the Lord, and in the second case, the future coming of the Lord guarantees the certainty of this destruction.

After this curse on those who do not love the Lord, Paul gives his blessing to the main body of the Corinthian Christians. Then, he closes by sending to them all his love in Christ.

The last word is *Amen*. As an anticlimactic conclusion for the commentary, these details are added. The Aland-Black-Metzger-Wikgren text omits the *Amen* in spite of the preponderance of evidence. B, two numbered uncials, and a few cursives omit it. Aleph, A, B, C, D, K, P, Psi, and a larger number of cursives have it. In his *Textual Commentary*, Metzger says, "The liturgical *Amen* is added in most witnesses." However, there is no evidence to support his assertion that it was added. Why not say, the "liturgical" *Amen* was carelessly dropped by a few scribes?

The same problem occurs in I Thessalonians 5:28, though the evidence in this case is slightly less.

Paul does not always end his letters with *Amen*. It is found in Romans, I Corinthians, Galatians, and I Thessalonians. The others, probably including Titus, do not have it.

Although not a Pauline epistle, II Peter is another case of this editorial procedure. Metzger (*op. cit.*, p. 707) says, "On the one hand the external testimony supporting the presence of *Amen* at the close of the doxology is almost overwhelming in scope and weight [What an admission!] including p72 Aleph, A, C [and some cursives and versions]. On the other hand, if the word were present originally, it is difficult to account for its absence . . . in B . . . as well as several other minuscules." So the editors put the *Amen* in square brackets at the end of II Peter.

In I John, the preponderance of evidence is against the *Amen*. However, the editors are clearly swayed by the idea of "liturgical addition." One must ask, how did such liturgical additions come into existence, if there were no original in-

stances of the *Amen*? How can such guesswork overbalance the actual evidence?

Whether or not there is an *Amen* should in each case be determined by the preponderance of evidence. For an editor to reject "evidence . . . almost overwhelming in scope and weight" and alter his published text on the unsupported supposition that some pious scribe added it for liturgical reasons, is not the best scholarship. Amen.

SCRIPTURE INDEX

Acts 219-220, 291

1:1 27
1:14 143
1:17-18 27
1:22 141
1:24 27
2:4-11 194
2:4, 6, 8, 11 229
2:6 222
2:8, 13 220
2:13 222
2:17 243
2:27, 31 306
2:47 21
3:1-11 81
3:37 136
7:9 210
7:38 152, 196
8:12 27
8:32 231
9:19 252
11:23 252
13:9-11 81
13:39 302
14:4, 14 254
16:3 138
17 258
17:5 210
17:16 235
17:28 131

17:32 253
18:5 235
18:25 235
19:6 218
19:21 235
20:6 236
21:4, 5, 11 172
21:9 171
22:20 98
23:7-8 257
24:1 236

I Chronicles 7

Colossians

1:18 169
2:2 33
2:8 163
2:11-12 108
2:13 286
3:3 315
3:22 167
4:18 320

I Corinthians 206, 321

1:1 31
1:4 31
1:5 20
1:8 32
1:13 32

1:14 32
 1:16 303
 1:17 50
 1:18 53
 1:18-25 50
 1:19 51
 1:19-2:16 3
 1:21 126
 1:22 51
 1:25, 27 52
 1:28 32
 1:30 304
 2:6 46
 2:6-7 38, 40
 2:8 38
 2:11 114, 234-235
 2:13, 14, 15 39
 2:14 298, 301-302
 2:16 51
 3:1 34
 3:5 114
 3:18 128
 3:19 46, 58
 3:20 52
 4:7 193, 210
 5:5 187, 304
 5:7 114
 5:9 18, 89
 5:9-11 83
 7:1 320
 7:1-7 91
 7:7 114
 7:10, 12 116
 7:14 91
 7:21, 36 304
 7:26 95
 8:4 127
 8:7 127
 8:7-13 166
 9:19 140
 9:22 144
 10:2-4 302
 10:16 160n., 182
 10:17 160n.
 10:21 76
 10:32 166
 11:2 179
 11:4 175
 11:13 172
 11:21 160n.
 11:51 187
 11:32 187
 11:34 187, 318
 12:6 304
 12:7 232
 12:7-10 47
 12:8 12, 46
 12:8-9 192
 12:10 190, 192, 222
 12:10, 29, 31 218
 12:11 197
 12:12 268
 12:14 198
 12:25 267
 12:26 283
 12:28 169, 215, 262
 13:1 204, 214, 218
 13:2 12, 46
 13:8 46, 47
 13:8-13 213
 14:2-5, 13, 19, 28 219
 14:4 222
 14:5 233, 304
 14:6 12
 14:7 304
 14:8, 11, 19, 20 220

14:9 222
 14:13 222
 14:14 228-229
 14:18 256
 14:28 222-223
 14:34-35 171
 14:39 223
 15 42, 270, 312
 15:20 290
 15:22 164, 307
 15:23 280
 15:24 269, 280, 282
 15:35 294
 15:36 287
 15:42-45 309
 15:44 301
 15:44, 46 42
 15:44-46 300-302
 15:50 299
 16:17 263
 21:11 221
 12:11 14, 256
 13:12-14 320
Daniel
 7:22 86
 12:1 273
Deuteronomy
 4:37 104
 12:18 161
 20:6 144
 20:14, 19-20 144
 21:10-13 108
 24:1 172
 24:7 85
 25:4 144, 145
Ephesians 218, 285, 320
 1:5 284
 1:10 169
 1:14 27
 1:17 76
 1:17-18 13, 48
 1:22 267
 2 196
 2:2 274
 2:5 284
 2:5-6 262
 3 196
 3:9-10 132
 4:30 27
 5:22-23 99
 5:25, 28 266
 6:6 167
 6:12 309
 6:21-24 320
II Corinthians 288, 291, 294, 320
 1:1 10
 1:19 234
 1:23 306
 2:3-4 83
 2:16 21
 4:13 76
 5:7 216
 6:14-7:1 83
 7:8 83
 7:12 78, 81
 10:10 265
 11:5 256
 11:15 14
 11:22 33
 12:2 57n.

Exodus 131, 154

14:21-22 152
17:6 153
32:6 154

Ezekiel

26:3 240
27:5, 4 240
28:2 240
29:2, 3 240

Galatians 18, 24, 90, 112,
218, 321

1:1 182
1:10 167, 191
1:12 252
1:14 168
1:16 309
1:17 182
1:19 143
2:3 138
2:6 182
2:6-9 256
2:15 9
3:6-29 152
3:28 174
5:17 232
6:3 128
6:16 152, 196

Genesis

1 305
2:7 305
2:18 95
3:16 248
15 228
22:1 157

Hebrews

1:14 87
2:8 267
2:14 309
2:17 305
5:1 37
5:10 83
5:11-14 80
5:11-6:20 83
6:1-2 60
6:12 210
6:15 210
7:1 83
9:5 303
9:12 27
9:26 156
13:4 93

Hosea

12:6 209
13:14 314

Isaiah 40, 53-56, 238-240

10:15 210
22:13 292
25:8 314
28:11-12 237
29:14 22, 51
40:13 44
52:15 37
53:11 269
56:12 282
64:1 37

James

1:13 157
2:13 257
3:5 210

3:14, 16 210
3:15 42, 298-299
4:13 289
4:16 210

Jeremiah

1:4, 5, 9 228
9:24 27
51:42 40

Joh

5:13 67

John 153, 206, 285, 288

1 24
1:1 70, 131
1:18 300
3:15-16 136
3:18 104
4:18 77
4:23-24 235
5:21 285
5:21-29 284
6:12 137
8:24 104
12:24 294
12:39-40 43
14:15 204
14:15, 21 208
15:10, 14 208
15:26 76
16:13 76
17 211, 269
19:11 62
21:15-17 207

I John 206, 321

2:2 303

2:3-5 208
2:5 204
2:8 120
2:17 120-121
4:1 194
4:6 76
4:7-8 129
4:10 303
5:2 209

II John

8 137
10 85

Jude

5 133
19 42, 298-299

II Kings 242**Leviticus** 161

7:15 160
8:31 160
18:8 78

Luke 303

1:17 109
1:47 235
2:7 143
12:6 236
12:47-48 62
12:52 236
13:23 21
14:19 236
15:4, 8, 9, 21, 32, 33 137
15:17 137
18:13 303
22:25 91

22:30 86
24:25 293
24:39 309

Mark

14:38 235
16:16 104

View Page 48 w. 81, 304
143

5:22 293
5:29-30 136, 137
7:26 294
9:13 128
9:17 137
10:10 146
10:28 306
10:42 137
16:17 309
18:15 80
18:15-18 88
18:28, 29 210
19:28 86, 92
22:44 265
23:17, 19 294
25:2, 3, 8 294
26:41 235

Numbers 154

14:2, 36 155
16:44-49 155
20:11 153
21:5-6 155
25:9 155

I Peter

2:11, 25 306
3:6 235

3:18 286
3:22 267

II Peter 13, 48, 127

1:2-3 13, 48, 127
1:3 293
1:16 265
1:17-18 231
2:8 306
2:16 231
3:6, 9 136
3:9 91
3:10 65

Philippians

2:4 164
2:12 265
2:13 192-193
2:25 63
3:4-8 53
4:3 63

Proverbs

3:3 209
6:34 210

Psalms 227

1:6 129
8:6 266
8:7 266
49:6 210
65:4 62
78:15 153
78:39 121
90:10 121
94:11 67
103:15-16 121
105:25 157

110:1 265-266
135:6 197, 269
139:1 38

Revelation 279

1:20 184
2:26-27 86
8:6 312
14:4 115
19 313
20 278, 312-313
20:4 306
20:4, 5, 6 313
20:7-8 313
20:14 266
21:20 289

Romans 6, 24, 82, 90, 288,
320-321

1:1 9
1:16 22
1:18 303
1:18-19 22
1:21 126
1:21-23 22
1:24, 26-27 84
1:27 89
1:30 210
2:42 136
3:25 303
4:13 67
5:12-21 164, 262, 307
6 113
7:14 60
8:11 286
8:15 76
8:23 289
8:27 38

8:28 67
9:5 289
9:21-23 132
10:9 191
11 196
11:1 53
11:16 108, 288
11:34 44
12:19 303
12:20 88
13:4-5 303
13:13 210
15:1 164
15:26 316
16:1-21 320
16:3, 9, 21 63

II Samuel

24:1 157

I Thessalonians 264, 268

1:1 254
3:2 63
4:16 274, 312
5:11 72
5:28 321

II Thessalonians 264

1:1 254
1:8 65
2 264
2:15 168
3:6 168
3:17 320

I Timothy

1:20 79
2:4 91

3:2 95
4:3 95
4:5 107
6:13 286

Zechariah
8 273
13:7 157

Titus

2:14 27

INDEX

- A. 31-32, 53n., 54n., 171, 182,
190, 209, 321
Aaron, 161
Abortion, 96
Abraham, 28, 53, 104, 108, 118,
121, 152, 157, 196, 246, 267
Abrahamic Covenant, 78; *see*
also Covenant
Achaia, 48
Achaicus, 319
Adam, 196, 261-262, 280, 287-
288, 294-295, 305-308, 314
Addiction, 93
Adoption, 76
Adoration, 234
Adultery, 77, 97, 101, 108, 125,
134, 203
Advent of Christ, 312; *see also*
Return of Christ, Second
Advent
Affection, 206
Agabus, 221
Agapao, 206-207, 217
Agape, 205-206
Agape, 188
Aland-Black-Metzger-Wikgren
Text, 146, 248, 321
Albright, William Foxwell, 58
Alph 3, 31-33, 53n., 54n., 171,
182, 190, 209, 321
Alford, 244
American Revised Version, 26,
50, 117, 178, 300
Amillennialism, 274, 313
Amillennialists, 156
Amoraic period, 270, 277
Anabaptists, 226
Analogy, 296
Ananias, 252
Angels, 67, 73, 86-87, 173, 205,
209, 214, 272, 297
Anger, 157
Annihilation, 271
Anthropopathisms, 39
Anti-intellectualism, 52, 237
Antichrist, 105, 118, 226
Antinomianism, 113, 302
Antinomians, 205
Antioch, 138
Apocalypse, 30-31, 278
Apocalypse of Baruch, 275
Apocrypha, 270-271, 272
Apodeixis, 54n.
Apollos, 4, 18-20, 40, 49, 61-63,
67, 70-72, 316, 319
Apostasy, 22
Apostles, 68, 73, 111, 127, 182,
191, 194, 195, 200-201, 213,
239, 245, 25, 256, 263
Aquila, 320

- Circumcision, 98, 108, 112-113, 138
- Clark, Gordon H., *Works: Historiography: Secular and Religious*, 255; *The Johanne Logos*, 56n.; *The Philosophy of Science and Belief in God*, 128
- Commandments, 112, 208, 210
- Commentary on First Corinthians* (Joseph Agar Beet), 219
- Commentary on First Corinthians* (Grosheide), 11, 12, 176
- Commentary on First Corinthians* (Leon Morris), 220
- Commentary on James* (Thomas Manton), 157
- Common notions, 162
- Communism, 316
- Communists, 186, 203-204
- Conceit, 128
- Concepts, 45
- Conceptuality, 54
- Confession, 191
- Confusion, 241, 244, 264
- Connaick, C. Milo, 18-19; *Works: The New Testament: An Introduction to Its History, Literature, and Thought*, 83
- Conscience, 133-134, 135, 136, 137-138, 164-166
- Conspiracy, 112
- Consummation, 213
- Contradiction, 53-54, 126, 128-129, 157, 163-164, 208
- Controversies, 180
- Conversion, 214
- Conybeare, 219-220; *Works: The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, 219-220
- Corinth, 6
- Cosmological argument, 52
- Cosmology, 11
- Court, 88-89
- Covenant, 108, 183-184, 196
- Covenanters, 241
- Cowles, Henry, 110, 132-133, 243
- Creation, 56, 132-133, 173-174, 246-247, 267, 275
- Crete, 160n.
- Crispus, 19
- Cross, of Christ, 19-21, 34, 49, 50, 53
- Crucifixion, of Christ, 28, 56, 141, 159, 183, 186
- Culver, Robert D., 283-284, 287-289
- Cumberland Presbyterian Church, 3
- Curse, 320-321
- Custom, 175, 176, 177, 188
- Cyrenaics, 292
- D, 31, 32, 33, 171, 190, 321
- D gr*, 32
- Damascus, 9, 57n., 141, 182
- Damnation, 154
- David, 157, 239, 241, 275
- Day of judgment, 15, 64, 65
- Day of the Lord, 68, 270-271, 274, 276

- De Magistro* (Augustine), 68-69
- Dead, 257; *see also* Baptism for the dead, Prayers for the dead
- Death, 21, 111, 187, 258, 261-262, 266-268, 282-283, 288, 309, 311, 313-315
- Decree, of God, 157, 158, 196
- DeGraaff, A.H., 246-247; *Works: Understanding the Scriptures*, 246-247
- Deity, of Christ, 24, 43n., 45, 50, 56, 63, 70, 255, 268, 289, 304; *see also* Christ
- Demetrius, 291
- Demons, 41, 130-131, 133, 161-162, 163, 190
- Denying the antecedent, 261n.; *see also* Logic
- Desertion, 108
- Dichotomy, 122
- Diogenes Laertius, 77, 160n.
- Discipline, 79, 84-85
- Dispensationalism, 152, 195
- Divine immutability, 121
- Divorce, 7, 100-103, 108-110, 116, 118, 172
- Doctrine, 3, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15-16, 17-18, 20, 22, 35, 45-46, 48, 49-51, 53, 55, 63, 68-69, 72, 74, 168, 193, 204, 211, 224, 226, 228, 241, 248, 150, 251, 289, 292
- Drunkenness, 93, 181
- Duquesne University, 224
- E, 171, 190
- Earth, 131, 164-165, 197, 217, 269, 273-275, 276
- Eating, 180
- Ecumenical leaders, 16
- Eddy, Mary Baker, 248
- Edification, 218, 222-223, 228-229, 231, 232, 234, 240-241, 249
- Education, 3, 22-23
- Egypt, 153
- Einstein, Albert, 128-129
- Elders, 200
- Elect, 22-24, 51
- Election, 9, 16, 24, 56, 54
- Electra* (Sophocles), 265
- Elijah, 273
- Ellicott, 5
- Eloquence, 50
- Elymas, 81
- Emmatus, 297
- Emotion, 38, 58, 123, 210, 237, 315
- Emotionalism, 230
- Empedoclean theory, 294
- Encounter, 53
- End, 263-264, 282, 311
- Energy, 294
- Enoch*, 271, 273-274, 275
- Ephesus, 66, 130, 318, 320
- Epicureans, 258, 291-292
- Epicurus, 291-292
- Epistemology, 68
- Equality, 174
- Erasmus, 30-31, 140
- Eratosthenes, 160n.
- Esaias, 43
- Esqu, 104

- Aquinas, Thomas, 52, 54
 Arabs, 204
 Arcadia, 160n.
 Archaeology, 58
 Ares, 130
 Argument, 21
 Arians, 45
 Aristotle, 94, 51-52, 54, 58, 183, 258, 294, 297-298; *Works: Nicomachean Ethics*, 266
 Arithmetic, 213
 Arminianism, 211
 Arminians, 211, 226
 Arminius, James, 226
 Arndt and Gingrich (lexicon), 12, 60, 119, 181, 160, 206, 265
 Arrogance, 68, 79, 81, 210
 Artemis, 111, 131
 Ascension, of Christ, 297
 Asceticism, 96, 99
 Asia Minor, 184
 Association for the Advancement of Christian Scholarship, 91, 246-247
Assumption of Moses, 275
 Assyrians, 238
 Athanasius, 180
 Athens, 23, 48, 51, 58
 Atomic theory, 294
 Atonement, 20, 28-29, 34-35, 37, 43, 50-52, 54, 60, 63-65, 75, 83, 180, 211, 213, 216, 233; *see also* Limited atonement
 Attributes, of God, 246
 Augustine, 68, 180, 268, 295-296; *Works: De Magistro*, 69
 Augustus, 91
 Author of sin, 157
 Authority, 173, 177, 215, 245
B, 31-33, 53n., 54n., 171, 182, 190, 209, 321
 Babylon, 40, 170
 Babylonians, 238
 Bach, J.S., 3
 Balaam, 231
 Baptism, 20, 49, 50, 60, 89-90, 106-108, 113, 152, 224, 290
 Baptism for the dead, 289-290
 Baptism in the Spirit, 226
 Baptists, 78, 152
 Barnabas, 142-143, 254
 Barth, Karl, 204, 253
 Baruch, 276
 Beet, Joseph Agar, 219; *Works: Commentary on First Corinthians*, 219
 Belief, 191; *see also* Faith, Justification
 Benevolence, 207
 Bengel, 156
 Berelgeuse, 296-297
 Beza, Theodore, 48, 205
 Bible, 7, 8, 13, 16, 53-54, 55-56, 61, 72, 93, 117, 126, 157, 162, 169, 185, 203, 211, 246-247, 251, 305, 310-311, 316
 Bishop, qualification of, 96
 Blood, of Christ, 159, 183-185; *see also* Atonement
 Body, 12, 92-94, 96, 150, 181, 183, 186-187, 194-195, 196-199, 295, 299-300, 306; of Christ, 159

- Botany, 47, 211, 296
 Bread, 159, 181, 183, 185, 186-187; *see also* Lord's Supper
 Britain, 255
 Brown, David, 264, 266; *Works: The Second Advent*, 264, 266
 Brunner, Emil, 53-54
 Buddhism, 169
 Burt, Edwin A., 190; *Works: Types of Religious Philosophy*, 190
 Business, 85
 Businessmen, 26, 83, 87
C, 3, 31, 53n., 54n., 171, 182, 190, 321
 Caesar, Julius, 255; *Works: Gallic War*, 255
 Calculus, 213
 Caleb, 154
 Calvin, John, 54, 68, 90, 153, 316; *Works: The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 156-159
 Calvinism, 226
 Campus Christians, 91
 Canon, of Scripture, 212, 215
 Capitalism, 316
Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture, A, 5
 Causation, 158
 Caynar, James J., 224
 Celibacy, 95, 99, 106, 116, 143
 Celsus, 112
 Cephas, 18, 142, 253; *see also* Peter
 Chance, 180
 Charismata, 201, 213, 215, 217; *see also* Gifts
 Charity, 206
 Chemistry, 294
 Children, 97, 105-106, 106-108
 Chiliasm, 279
 Chloe, 18
 Christ, 4, 9, 13, 17, 18-19, 23, 26-28, 36-37, 45-46, 49, 50, 52-53, 56, 58, 59, 63-64, 67-68, 70-71, 73-74, 82-85, 91, 92, 94, 99-100, 108, 113, 121, 131-132, 135, 137-138, 145, 148-149, 151-153, 154-156, 164, 168, 169-171, 180, 182, 183, 186, 195-196, 204, 207, 209, 211-212, 224, 226, 246, 248, 250, 251-255, 256, 258, 259-263, 265-268, 269, 271, 273, 280-283, 285, 287-289, 294-295, 303, 305-306, 308, 310, 321; deity of, 24, 13n., 45, 50, 56, 63, 70, 255, 268, 289, 304; return of, 156, 216; *see also* Incarnation, Jesus, Second Advent
 Christianity, 163
 Chrysostom, 170
 Church, 63-64, 65-67, 69, 74-75, 77, 78, 82, 84-85, 87-88, 96, 99, 106, 125, 167, 169, 171, 177-179, 181, 184, 189, 193, 195, 197, 199-200, 207, 209, 218, 222, 223, 226, 230, 233, 236, 238, 240-241, 245, 246, 247-248, 249, 252, 256, 259, 268, 320

- Eschatology, 264, 269-270, 271-272, 275, 295
 Estius, 201
 Eternal life, 167, 285
 Eternal state, 270
 Eternity, 9
 Ethics, 7, 293
 Eucharist, 226; *see also* Bread
 Euripides, 292
 Evangelical Theological Society, 283
 Evangelicals, 17, 58, 193, 246
 Evangelism, 219n
 Evangelization, 29
 Evil, 82-84, 156-157, 166, 180, 209, 237, 274, 293
 Excellence, 232
 Experience, 34, 36, 57, 220, 225, 226, 227-228, 245
 Expiation, 303
Expositor's Greek New Testament (Findlay), 141
 Ezra, 103, 108-109
IV Ezra, 271, 275-276
 F, 171
 Faith, 28, 34, 37, 46-47, 54, 60-62, 69-70, 132, 183, 189, 193-194, 201-202, 205, 208-209, 214-216, 250, 255, 257-258, 259, 319
 Fall, of man, 300
 False leaders, 75
 False prophets, 22
 False teachers, 64, 75
 Fathers, 152
 Federal headship, 307
 Feeling, 12, 71
 Findlay, *Works: Expositor's Greek New Testament*, 141
First Epistle to the Corinthians: The (H. L. Goudge), 220
 Flag (American), 186
 Flaminius, Caius, 254
 Flesh, 24, 27, 44, 80, 93, 160, 235, 287, 296, 299, 309
 Flesh and blood, 309
 Fletcher, Joseph, 203, 205
 Flux, 120-121
 Food, 90, 82, 107, 134-135, 138, 148, 151, 207
 Food laws, 113
 Foreign languages, 189, 194, 236-238, 240-241; *see also* Gibberish, Tongues
 Foreordination, 36, 75
 Fornication, 77, 84, 90-93, 94-96, 99, 154-155
 Fortunatus, 319
 Fosdick, Harry E., 80
 Four spiritual laws, 149
 Free will, 65, 193-194, 195, 227, 256
 Freedom, 115, 165-166, 170
 Freeman, 195
Full Gospel Business Men's Voice, 223
 Fundamentalist, 56
 Furnish, Victor Paul, *Works: The Love Command in the New Testament*, 203-205
 G, 31, 171
 Gaius, 19
 Galatia, 141

- Galilee, 254, 297
 Gallic War (Caesar), 255
 Goddes, Jennie, 297
 Gentiles, 22, 23, 37, 112, 130, 149, 152, 161, 189, 195-196, 236, 274
 "Gentle Revolution, The Catholic Pentecostal Movement in Retrospect," 223-224
 Gibberish, 205, 219, 220, 222-223, 227-228, 234-235, 237, 239, 240; *see also* Foreign languages, Tongues
 Gideon, 22
 Gifts, 14-15, 26, 41, 111-112, 169-190, 191, 193, 195, 200-202, 211, 215-216, 218, 232, 239, 243, 301, 304
 Glory of God, 36, 167
 Glossolalia, 234; *see also* Foreign languages, Gibberish, Tongues
Glossolalia (Frank Stagg), 220
 Gnosis, 11, 12, 13, 58
 Gnosticism, 11
 Gnostics, 12
 God, 7, 10, 11, 15-16, 20, 22, 24-26, 29, 31, 35-37, 38-41, 43, 49, 51-52, 54, 56, 59, 61-64, 68-70, 73, 82, 85, 89-92, 98, 103, 104, 107-108, 110-111, 112-113, 11, 126, 128, 129-130, 131-132, 134, 139, 144, 145, 151, 154-155, 156-157, 161, 163, 167, 169, 173-176, 180-181, 183, 188, 190-193, 194-201, 205-206, 208, 210, 212, 214, 218, 221-223, 225-226, 228, 230, 232, 233, 235, 236-239, 240-247, 255-257, 258, 261-262, 267-269, 271-273, 274, 276, 290-293, 294-297, 300-301, 303, 304, 306, 309, 311, 315; God the Father, 4, 49, 67, 131, 132, 136, 163, 192, 235, 253, 261, 263, 265-267, 269, 284-286, 300, 304, 311, 313; image of, 300; sovereignty of, 158; *see also* Holy Spirit, Jesus, Christ
 Golden calf, 154
 Goodwin, Thomas, *Works: Greek Grammar*, 23
 Gospel, 14, 20-22, 33, 40, 49, 65, 74, 111-112, 145, 150, 151, 182, 185, 211, 218, 220, 233, 234, 236, 239-242, 248, 250-251, 252, 254, 257, 269
 Goudge, H.L., *Works: The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 220
 Government, 105, 252
 Grace, 3, 10, 11, 15, 26, 62-63, 84, 113, 127, 159, 165, 227, 230, 233, 256-257, 262, 315, 320
 Graven images, 130
 Greece, 10
 Greediness, 210
 Greek, 1, 2, 3
Greek Grammar (Thomas Goodwin), 23
 Greeks, 22, 24, 97, 167, 195

- Gromacki, Robert G., *Works: The Modern Tongues Movement*, 227
- Grosheide, F.W., 5, 142, 161-162; *Works: Commentary on 1 Corinthians*, 11, 12, 176
- Guthrie, Thomas, *Works: The New Bible Commentary: Revised*, 222
- Hair, 168, 170, 171, 175-176, 178
- Hannibal, 264
- Hanoi, 186
- Hats, 170-171, 173, 175, 177
- Head, 169, 173, 177, 237
- Healing, 193-194, 200-201
- Heart, 38, 43, 123, 191, 237
- Heathen, 65, 126, 131
- Heaven, 65, 131, 141, 153, 197, 211-214, 216-217, 263, 265, 269, 273-275, 278, 294, 308
- Hegel, G.W.F., 58
- Hell, 84, 137, 269, 276, 293
- Heraclitus, 297-298
- Heresies, 11, 18, 64, 74, 81, 180, 251
- Herod, 37, 272
- Herodotus, 54n.
- Hinson, 220
- Historiography, 255
- Historiography: Secular and Religious* (Gordon H. Clark), 255
- History, 36, 58, 156, 280, 296
- Hocking, William E., 162
- Hodge, Charles, 38, 40, 44-47, 63, 72, 84, 117, 136-137, 153, 205, 212, 231, 232, 241, 243-244, 254-255, 269-270, 283-284, 287-289, 292, 299-300, 306-307, 316-317
- Holiness, 26-27, 53, 125, 157-158
- Holiness Movement, 227
- Holy Spirit, God the, 8, 12, 14, 17, 33-34, 37-38, 40, 42, 43, 46, 49, 55, 56-57, 59-60, 65, 66, 76, 89, 94, 124, 133, 189, 190, 191, 192-193, 195, 218, 221, 224, 225, 226, 235-236, 240, 243-244, 248, 260, 266, 279, 286-287, 299-301, 302, 306
- Home, 169
- Homer, 205
- Homosexuality, 89
- Homosexuals, 79, 84, 89
- Hope, 214-216
- Howson, *Works: The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, 219-220
- Human nature, 11, 186
- Humility, 197
- Hypocrisy, 18
- Iconium, 138
- Ideas, 16, 17
- Idolaters, 154
- Idolatry, 126-127, 130, 133, 135, 136, 142, 154, 158, 161, 164, 166-167, 189-190, 231
- Ignorance, 13, 150, 292-293
- Image of God, 172-173, 295, 299
- Image of man, 173

- Immerision, 152; *see also* Baptism
- Immortality, 274-275
- Imputed righteousness, 27; *see also* Justification
- Incarnation, 153, 306-308; *see also* Christ, Jesus
- Incas, 91
- Incest, 77-78, 81, 84, 134, 139, 248
- Incommunicable attributes, of God, 233; *see also* God
- Induction, 144
- Inerrancy, 40, 101, 204, 266
- Infant baptism 78, 104; *see also* Immersion
- Inspiration, 47, 57, 101, 116, 151, 157, 164, 175, 191, 220, 251, 226-267, 279, 304, 306; *see also* Bible, Inerrancy
- Institutes of the Christian Religion; The* (John Calvin), 158-159
- Intellectualism, 16-17
- Inquisition, 11, 12
- Intuitions of the Mind* (James McCosh), 11
- Irvingites, 220
- Isaac, 105, 108, 124
- Ishmael, 104-105, 108
- Islam, 163
- Israel, 152, 157, 160, 196, 248, 271-274, 302
- Israelites, 151-152, 204, 238, 272
- James, 413, 158, 229, 253-254
- Jealousy, 210
- Jehovah, 45, 131, 153, 155, 191, 266; *see also* Christ, God, Jesus
- Jehovah's Witnesses, 70, 131
- Jereboam, 131
- Jerusalem, 51, 58, 186, 235, 240, 254, 272-273, 316-319
- Jerusalem Council, 112, 138
- Jesus Christ, 10, 11, 14-16, 18, 23, 25, 27, 29, 32, 37, 42, 43n., 44, 45, 79-80, 89, 102, 128, 131-133, 140-143, 153, 155, 163, 167, 182, 185, 189-191, 204, 226, 232-254, 257, 267-269, 296, 290, 294, 305, 307, 309, 315, 320; *see also* Christ, God
- Jewish church, 152
- Jews, 22, 24, 27, 37, 86, 103, 118, 138, 148, 161, 167, 195-196, 220, 237-239, 271, 274
- Johannine Logos, The* (Gordon H. Clark), 56n.
- John, 40, 43n., 182, 204-205, 208, 229, 279
- John the Baptist, 128
- Jordan, 154
- Joseph, 143, 305
- Josephus, 271
- Joshua, 154
- Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 46n.
- Jubilees, 273
- Judaism, 108, 269-271, 274
- Judaizers, 65, 138
- Judas, 180, 269, 289
- Jacob, 3

- Judgment, 71, 86-87, 186, 215, 242, 272, 275-276
Judith, 273
 Justice, 82, 258, 303
 Justification, 24, 42, 69, 75, 90, 157, 183, 208, 212, 216, 225, 226, 233, 255, 289, 302
 K, 171, 321
 Kant, Immanuel, 12
 Kenyon, 58
Kerugma, 35, 55
 Kierkegaard, Søren, 53
 King James Version, 26, 29, 42, 48-49, 61-62, 66, 68, 71, 72, 95, 119, 122, 114, 117, 131, 135, 137, 144, 148, 156, 168, 178, 182, 187, 189, 193, 200-201, 208, 214, 244, 266, 286, 292, 298, 300-301, 302-303
 Kingdom of God, 75, 89, 111, 228, 261, 263, 266, 275, 276, 279, 283, 282, 309
 Knowledge, 11, 12, 13, 14, 38, 53, 46-49, 56, 58, 69, 126-128, 129, 133-135, 189, 193-194, 197, 202, 205, 208, 211-214, 216, 219, 228, 293, 316
 Knox, John, 297
Kommentar zum NT aus Talmud und Midrasch (Strack and Billerbeck), 153, 272
 L, 171, 190
 Labor, 115
 Lange, 5
 Language, 222-223, 233
 Languages, 193, 195, 200-201, 205, 209, 211, 214, 216, 218-220, 228, 231
 Last Supper, 251
 Law of God, 95, 108, 112, 113, 134, 144, 145, 148-149, 203-204, 237, 244, 246, 255, 302
 Laws, 103, 311, 314
 Lazarus, 23, 255
 Lenski, R.C.H., 5
 Liberals, 16
 Liberation, 115
 Liddell and Scott (lexicon), 12, 43n., 57n., 60, 84, 160, 162, 168, 206, 265, 283
 Life, 128
Life and Epistles of St. Paul, The (Conybeare and Howson), 219-220
 Lightfoot, 5
 Limited atonement, 91; *see also* Atonement
Living Today, 16
 Livy, 254
 Locke, John, 294
 Logic, 52, 54, 98, 100, 136, 142, 157, 261n.; *see also* Reason
 Logo, 48
 Logos, 11, 13, 20, 29, 32, 46, 50, 52, 55, 64, 68, 75, 132, 212
 Lord's Day, 317
 Lord's Prayer, 217
 Lord's Supper, 83, 113, 158-159, 178-180, 183-184, 187-188
 Love, 54, 126-127, 129, 161, 201-206, 208-211, 214-218, 238, 247, 268, 316, 319, 321
Love Command in the New Testament, The (Victor Paul Furnish), 203
 Love-ethics, 204
 Luther, Martin, 30, 68, 180, 183, 296-297
 Lutherans, 159, 185
 Lystra, 138
 H. Maccabbes, 271, 273
 Macartney, Clarence E., 80
 Mafia, 204
 Mafiosi, 89
 Magic, 229
 Man, 169-170, 172-175, 235, 247
 Man of sin, 226
 Man, the image of God, 173
 Marana, 158
 Manners, 176-177
 Manton, Thomas, *Works: Commentary on James*, 157
 Mariolatry, 225
 Marriage, 3, 77, 84, 91, 93, 94-97, 98-103, 104-106, 109-112, 115-116, 118-119, 120, 124, 139, 174
 Marshall, John, 86
 Martyr, Justin, 211, 213
 Marxism, 190
 Mary, 148, 191, 225, 226, 305, 308
 Mass, 226
 Mathematics, 210-211
 Mathias, 182
 Matter, 12, 294
 McCosh, James, *Works:*

- Intuitions of the Mind*, 11
 McPherson, Aimee Semple, 248
 Meat, 133, 135, 137, 142, 161, 164-165, 167
 Megara, 23
 Member (of church), 197-200
Memorabilia (Xenophon), 207
 Memory, 295
 Men, 174, 146
 Mercy, 13, 104, 116, 209-210, 303
 Message, 194
 Messiah, 149, 272-273, 274, 275-276
 Messianic Age, 66-67, 276-277, 289, 282
 Messianic Kingdom, 73, 282
 Messianism, 275
 Metaphysics, 52
 Metzger, Bruce, *Works: A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 248, 321
 Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm, 1, 2, 13, 41, 46, 48, 63, 98, 100, 107, 117, 119, 123, 146, 150, 153, 161, 211, 213-214, 221, 234, 242-244, 250, 256, 262-263, 277, 289, 292, 298, 307, 312, 317
 Michael, 273
 Midrash, 155
 Military service, 144
 Milk, 59-60
 Millennium, 121, 156, 270, 277-279, 280, 282, 289, 296, 312

- Mind, 16, 17, 33, 44, 49, 64, 124, 219, 228, 230, 233, 234, 236, 237, 244, 286; *see also* Intellect, Understanding
- Mind of Christ, 34, 44-45, 58
- Ministers, 65
- Miracles, 23, 75, 111, 193-194, 200-202, 211-212, 216-217, 229
- Moab, 154
- Modern Tongues Movement, The* (Robert G. Gromacki), 227
- Modernist, 56
- Modesty, 177
- Money, 48
- Moralia* (Plutarch), 169
- Moral law, 149
- Morality, 134
- Mormons, 289
- Morris, Leon, 177, 251, 262; *Works: Commentary on I Corinthians*, 229
- Moses, 23, 91, 144, 151-152, 154-155, 163, 196, 302
- Moderns, 176
- Motion, 12
- Murder, 7, 97, 211
- Musical instruments, 78
- Mysteries, 12, 28-29, 32, 54, 55, 68, 221, 310
- Mystery religions, 12, 35
- Mystic feeling, 11-12
- Mysticism, 56, 57n.
- Mystics, 55
- Napoleon, 103, 247
- Natural theology, 52, 54-56
- Nature, 103, 128, 175
- Necessity, 180
- Neo-evangelicalism, 13
- Neo-orthodoxy, 253
- Neoplatonism, 234
- Nestle's text, 300
- New American Bible, 177
- New American Standard Version, 13, 14, 21, 26, 29, 41, 66, 72-73, 76-77, 94-95, 114, 119, 144, 156, 168-169, 172, 177, 187, 193, 200-201, 208, 244, 248, 292, 298
- New English Bible, 29, 114, 177
- New Jerusalem, 274-275
- New York Times, The*, 224
- New Bible Commentary: Revised, The* (Guthrie), 222
- New Testament: An Introduction to its History, Literature, and Thought, The* (C. Miles Connick), 83
- New birth, 285; *see also* Regeneration
- Nicene Council, 143
- Nicomachean Ethics*, (Aristotle), 265
- Nisan, 186
- Nonsense, 22, 24, 34, 42, 51-53, 66, 228-230
- Notre Dame, 224-225
- Number, 12
- Nunneries, 96
- Nygrén, 205

- Obedience, 113, 204-205, 208, 217, 268
- Observation, 103, 176
- Oecumenism, 299
- Oedipus, 77
- Old Testament, 78, 85, 89, 93, 95, 97-100, 104-107, 108, 113, 121, 143, 146, 151-153, 154, 155, 158, 175, 190-191, 196, 255, 270, 271, 272-273, 278, 303-304, 306
- Olshausen, 127
- Olympic games, 92, 150
- Omnipotence, of God, 129, 163, 307
- Omniscience, of God, 129
- Onesimus, 114
- Ordination, 60, 106
- Organizational union, 18; *see also* Unity
- Orphics, 258
- Osterwald, 178
- Oxford, 58
- P 46*, 53n., 54n., 155, 182, 209, 321
- Pagans, 131, 132, 174, 190
- Pain, 291
- Palestine, 154, 170, 172
- Papacy, 68, 105
- Papal encyclicals, 259
- Paradise, 295
- Parousia, 46, 117-121, 213, 262, 265, 269, 278, 283, 289, 310, 311, 313
- Passover, 82-83, 113-114, 184
- Paul, 3-7, 9-10, 12-20, 22-23, 25-29, 34-35, 38-41, 44-45, 47-57, 60-62, 64-65, 167, 69, 72, 74-78, 80-82, 84-92, 96, 103, 106, 108-109, 112-114, 116-118, 120-121, 123, 128, 130, 132-133, 134, 138-142, 145-155, 158-159, 161, 164, 166, 168, 170-171, 172, 174, 176-179, 181-183, 185-186, 188, 190-191, 197-198, 201, 204, 207-208, 211, 213, 215, 219, 221-223, 228-232, 234, 237, 239-240, 242-243, 246, 248-254, 256-261, 261-264, 266-268, 277-280, 282-284, 289-299, 301, 305-306, 309, 310, 312-314, 316-318, 320, 321
- Pauline Eschatology, The* (Geerhardus Vos), 278-281
- Peasants, 26
- Penance, 225
- Pentecost, 219, 220, 222, 239, 240, 243, 318
- Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church, The* 226
- Pentecostalism, 194, 222-224, 226-227, 231
- Pentecostals, 228, 234, 236, 237, 240
- Perfection, 69, 227
- Perfectionism* (B.B. Warfield), 227
- Permission, 156-158
- Persecution, 6, 99, 104, 116, 118, 121, 252, 259-260, 290
- Perseverance of the saints, 3, 15, 250

- Person, 63-64, 162, 234, 294-296
 Perspicuous, 259
 Peru, 91
 Peter, 18-19, 49, 62-63, 67, 71-72, 103, 107, 138, 207, 220, 256
 Pharaoh, 170
 Pharisee, 22, 25, 36, 42, 43n., 85, 89, 190, 254, 257, 271
 Philemon, 114
Phileo, 206-207
 Philip, 171-172, 194
 Phillips, J.B., 29, 114, 174
 Philosophy, 22, 51-52, 64, 291
Philosophy of Science and Belief in God, *The* (Gordon H. Clark), 128
 Physical resurrection, 284-287
 Physics, 103, 175, 294, 311
 Pietism, 13
 Pietists, 55
 Piety, 13, 128
 Pinder, 38
 Plato, 51
 Platonists, 258
Playboy, 96
Playgirl, 96
 Pleasure, 291
 Plutarch, *Works: Moralia*, 169
 Plymouth Brethren, 145
 Poetry, 296
 Polaris, 296
 Police brutality, 247
 Polygamy, 96
 Polytheism, 163, 203
 Pontius Pilate, 36-37, 192, 253
 Pope, 105, 126
 Poseidon, 130, 161
 Postmillennialism, 266
 Poverty, 316
 Power, 79
 Power of God, 21-23, 28-29, 34; *see also* God, Omnipotence
 Prayer, 96-97, 170, 171, 173, 177, 186, 221, 234-236, 242; for the dead, 65
 Preaching, 14, 29, 33, 34-35, 50, 54, 62, 74, 194, 222, 234, 236, 240, 252, 258
 Predestination, 36
 Predeterminism, 36
 Premillennialism, 3, 156, 269, 274, 278, 280, 284
Presbyterian Journal, The, 55
 Presbyterians, 3, 78, 234
 Pride, 67, 72
 Priests, 190
 Prisca, 320
 Private property, 87, 91
 Proclus, 234
 Promiscuity, 96n., 207
 Prophecy, 193-194, 201, 205, 208, 211-212, 214-215, 216, 218-225, 228, 237, 239, 240, 243
 Prophesying, 168, 171, 173, 177
 Prophets, 23, 170, 182, 191, 200-201, 223, 231, 211-244, 263
 Propitiation, 303
 Propositions, 7, 13, 55-56, 77, 221
 Protestantism, 259

- Protestants, 105
 Providence, 151
 Psalms, 241
Psalter of Solomon, 271
 Pseudepigrapha, 270-273
Psi, 321
 Psychology, 136, 210, 234, 244, 301
 Punctuation, 244-245
 Punishment, 62, 186, 258
 Puritan Principle, 72
 Purpose, 54, 103
 Pyrgion, 160n.
 Pythagoras, 160n.
 Queen Elizabeth, 105
 Rabbi Jehoshua, 170
 Rachel, 3
 Radicalism, 3
 Rape, 211
 Rationality, 55, 236
 Real Presence, 226
 Reason, 40-41, 48, 222, 244, 246; *see also* Logic
 Reasoning, 33, 52, 291
 Rebellion, 105
 Redemption, 18, 26-27, 53
 Reformation, 30, 108, 226
 Reformed Presbyterian Church, Evangelical Synod, 214-215
 Reformers, 105
 Regeneration, 17, 21, 75, 92, 125, 149, 208, 281, 287, 302; *see also* New birth
 Reign of Christ, 311
 Remuneration, 143, 146-147
 Renan, Ernst, 190
 Repentance, 60, 196
 Reprobate, 269
 Responsibility, 37
 Ress, W., 5
 Resurrection, 3, 60, 92, 156, 164, 196, 250, 252-253, 254, 255, 257-258, 259-262, 263, 269-270, 271, 274-276, 281, 284, 286-287, 289, 290-294, 296-297, 305-308, 311-312; body, 293-295, 301; of Christ, 264-286; of the wicked, 264, 271, 278, 280-282, 284, 287, 312
 Return of Christ, 117-118, 215; *see also* Second advent
 Revealed theology, 55
Revelation Is Not Enough (A.W. Tozer), 55
 Revelation, 1, 7, 14, 37, 39-41, 42, 56, 58, 76, 100, 103, 151, 182-183, 191, 212, 228, 230, 241-244, 218, 252, 278, 313
 Revelations, 224-225
 Revised Standard Version, 14, 21, 26, 41, 50, 71, 114, 144, 168, 177, 179, 187, 192-193, 200-201, 208, 243, 251, 300-302, 303-305
 Revolution, 112, 116
 Reward, 62, 65
 Righteous, 271-272
 Righteousness, 26, 53, 168, 248, 274, 276
 Ritual law, 149
 Robertson, A.T., 182
 Robertson, E.M., 4, 19, 89, 151

- Robinson, William Childs, 300
- Rock, 151, 153
- Roman Catholic Church, 66, 96, 105, 106, 130-131, 159, 169, 184, 215, 224-225, 226-227, 275, 320
- Ruckert, 201
- Russell, Bertrand, 259-260
- Russia, 103
- Sacramentarianism, 184; *see also* Lord's Supper
- Sacraments, 68, 106, 185, 290; *see also* Baptism, Lord's Supper
- Sacrifice, 126-127, 130, 133, 135, 151, 160-161, 165, 182, 253, 269
- Sadducees, 22, 89, 257
- Saints, 9, 10, 86-87
- Salvation, 12, 22, 36-37, 57n., 62, 87, 90, 104, 149, 164, 227, 238, 250-251, 270, 273-275, 258-259, 262, 268-269, 281, 290; *by* works, 65
- Sanctification, 15, 21, 64, 88, 90, 149, 286
- Sanhedrin, 293
- Sarah, 105
- Sarcasm, 71, 73-74, 128, 130, 249
- Satan, 44, 79-82, 96-97, 157, 162, 187, 269, 273-274, 313
- Savagery, 3
- Schisms, 16-17, 49, 50, 179
- Science, 20, 103, 294
- Scientism, 162
- Scripture Press, 17
- Second advent, 121; *see also* Return of Christ
- Second Advent. The* (David Brown), 264, 266
- Secrets, 12, 36, 38, 218; *see also* Mystery
- Seduction, 123
- Seerveld, C.G., *Works: Understanding the Scriptures*, 246-247
- Seizure, 141
- Self control, 150-151, 222
- Self-discipline, 151
- Sensations, 297-299
- Separation, 101
- Septuagint, 51n., 155, 191, 206, 238, 266
- Serpents, 155
- Seventh Day Adventism, 317
- Sex, 91, 92, 95, 207
- Sibylline Oracles, 271
- Signature, 9
- Signs, 22-23, 111, 237, 239
- Silence, 244
- Silvanus, 254
- Sin, 10, 15, 17, 18, 21, 27, 62, 64, 69, 77, 81, 82-84, 86-87, 90, 93, 94-95, 118, 125-126, 136, 138, 150, 157, 164, 167, 170, 176, 180, 233, 240, 250, 253, 258-259, 262, 272, 276, 284-285, 287, 292-293, 299, 302-303, 307, 309, 314-315
- Sinai, 153
- Sinlessness, 10, 15
- Sirach*, 273
- Situation ethics, 89, 203, 205

- Slavery, 3, 110, 113-115, 195
- Sodom, 269
- Sola Scriptura*, 58, 127
- Son, God the, 49, 67, 192, 268-269, 275, 285; *see also* Christ, God, Jesus
- Son of Man, 268
- Son of perdition, 226
- Sophia*, 12, 50, 52, 58
- Sophocles, *Works: Electra*, 265
- Sostrhenes, 9
- Soul, 258, 299, 306
- Souer (lexicon), 57n.
- Southern Presbyterian Journal, The*, 300
- Space, 12, 297
- Speech, 28
- Spinoza, Baruch, 190
- Spirits, 194-195, 231, 232, 234
- "Spokane Story, The," 224
- Stagg, Frank, *Works: Glossologia*, 220
- Stanley, Dean, 249
- Stephanus, 319
- Stephen, 19, 98
- Stoics, 162, 175, 258, 298
- Stomach, 92
- Strack and Billerbeck, 153; *Works: Kommentar zum NT aus Talmud und Midrasch*, 272
- Submission, 173
- Subordination, 67
- Suits, 86
- Superstition, 136, 138, 150-151
- Supreme Court, 87
- Syllabus of Errors, 105
- System, 5
- Talmuds, 277
- Taney, Chief Justice, 86-87
- Tannaitic period, 270-277
- Targums, 155
- Taylor, C. Aiken, 55
- Teachers, 195, 200-201
- Teburnis Papyri, 265
- Temple of God, 65-66, 94, 236
- Temptation, 151, 158, 156-157
- Ten Commandments, 89, 91, 92, 203, 247, 302
- Tertullian, 51-52
- Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 271, 275
- Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, A* (Bruce Metzger), 248, 321
- Textual criticism, 2, 30, 32-33
- Textus Receptus*, 30, 140, 171, 189, 201, 217, 308
- Thanksgiving, 177, 236
- Thayer's lexicon, 288
- Theft, 7
- Theology, 17, 21, 335, 47, 64
- Theophylact, 290
- Theopompus, 160n.
- theoretical knowledge, 127
- Time, 12, 117, 217
- Timidity, 76
- Timothy, 74-75, 138, 254, 316, 318-319
- Titus, 138, 321
- Tobit*, 273
- Tongues, 189-190, 205, 211-212, 215, 218-219, 221-223, 224, 228, 230, 233, 234, 236, 237, 238-241, 245, 248-249, 256; *see also* Foreign

- languages, Gibberish.
Languages
Total depravity, 42
Tozer, A.W., 55-56; *Works: Revelation Is Not Enough*, 55
Tradition, 100, 168-169, 225
Transcendence of God, 45
Transfiguration, 265
Translation, 5, 222, 233
Transubstantiation, 183, 225
Treasury of the saints, 225
Trichotomy, 122; *see also* Man
Trinity, 4, 67, 132, 152, 192, 252, 267-268, 289
Trumpet, 312
Truth, 8, 24-25, 42, 49, 52, 54, 55-56, 58, 64, 82-83, 199, 205, 209-211, 212-213, 223, 251-252, 255, 276, 287
Tschernowitz, Chaim, 128
Types of Religious Philosophy (Edwin A. Burtt), 190

Understanding, 220, 221, 222, 228-229, 237, 244
Understanding the Scriptures (A.H. DeGraaf and C.G. Seerveld), 246-247
United States, 186
Unity, 16, 18, 75, 195, 225, 234
Universal salvation, 4, 284
Universalism, 268
Universe, 131-132

Vandalism, 3
Veils, 172, 175, 178
Virgins, 115

Voice, 225-226
Volition, 210
Vos, Geerhardus, 282-283, 289, 311-312; *Works: The Pauline Eschatology*, 278-281
Vulgate (Jerome), 30

Walvoord, John, 227
War, 143-144, 266
Warfield, B.B., *Works: Perfectionism*, 227
Wars of liberation, 271
Wellington, 247
Wesley, Charles, 216
Wesleyanism, 226
Westcott and Hort, 244, 300
Westminster Catechism, 167
Westminster Confession, 55, 105, 225, 255, 259
White, Ellen G., 248
Widows, 98-99, 122
Will, 210; of God, 9
Wilson, Geoffrey B., 4, 5
Wine, 185
Wisdom, 19, 20, 22, 23, 26-29, 34, 36, 41-42, 45-49, 50-53, 54-55, 57, 64, 66, 67, 88, 132, 189, 193-194, 201-202, 205, 212, 228; of God, 22-24, 58
Wittgenstein, Ludwig, 58
Woman, 168, 169-170, 171, 172-175, 177, 200, 241, 244, 245, 247, 248
Women's liberation, 96n., 246
Wonders, 111; *see also* Miracles
Word of God, 62, 72, 168, 248; *see also* Bible, Jesus, Christ

- Word of life, 21
Words, 41-43, 57
Works, 65, 208, 227
World, 25, 40, 66, 86-87, 120, 122, 130, 188
World War I, 103
World War II, 177
Worldly powers, 36
Worship, 78, 150, 161-162, 163, 169, 171, 175, 225, 230, 235, 240-241, 304

Wrath, of God, 84, 186, 238, 259, 272, 303

Xenophon, *Works: Memorabilia*, 206-207

Zeus, 130, 161, 190
Zoology, 175
Zwingli, Ulrich, 183

The Crisis of Our Time

Historians have christened the thirteenth century the Age of Faith and termed the eighteenth century the Age of Reason. The twentieth century has been called many things: the Atomic Age, the Age of Inflation, the Age of the Tyrant, the Age of Aquarius. But it deserves one name more than the others: the Age of Irrationalism. Contemporary secular intellectuals are anti-intellectual. Contemporary philosophers are anti-philosophy. Contemporary theologians are anti-theology.

In past centuries secular philosophers have generally believed that knowledge is possible to man. Consequently they expended a great deal of thought and effort trying to justify knowledge. In the twentieth century, however, the optimism of the secular philosophers has all but disappeared. They despair of knowledge.

Like their secular counterparts, the great theologians and doctors of the church taught that knowledge is possible to man. Yet the theologians of the twentieth century have repudiated that belief. They also despair of knowledge. This radical skepticism has filtered down from the philosophers and theologians and penetrated our entire culture, from television to music to literature: *The Christian in the twentieth century is confronted with an overwhelming cultural consensus—sometimes stated explicitly but most often implicitly: Man does not and cannot know anything truly.*

What does this have to do with Christianity? Simply this:

If man can know nothing truly, man can truly know nothing. We cannot know that the Bible is the Word of God, that Christ died for sin, or that Christ is alive today at the right hand of the Father. Unless knowledge is possible, Christianity is nonsensical, for it claims to be knowledge. What is at stake in the twentieth century is not simply a single doctrine, such as the Virgin Birth, or the existence of hell, as important as those doctrines may be, but the whole of Christianity itself. If knowledge is not possible to man, it is worse than silly to argue points of doctrine—it is insane.

The irrationalism of the present age is so thorough-going and pervasive that even the Remnant—the segment of the professing church that remains faithful—has accepted much of it, frequently without even being aware of what it was accepting. In some circles this irrationalism has become synonymous with piety and humility, and those who oppose it are denounced as rationalists—as though to be logical were a sin. Our contemporary anti-theologians make a contradiction and call it a Mystery. The faithful ask for truth and are given Paradox. If any balk at swallowing the absurdities of the anti-theologians, they are frequently marked as heretics or schismatics who seek to act independently of God.

There is no greater threat facing the true Church of Christ at this moment than the irrationalism that now controls our entire culture. Communism, guilty of tens of millions of murders, including those of millions of Christians, is to be feared, but not nearly so much as the idea that we do not and cannot know the truth. Hedonism, the popular philosophy of America, is not to be feared so much as the belief that logic—that “mere human logic,” to use the religious irrationalists’ own phrase—is futile. The attacks on truth, on revelation, on the intellect, and on logic are renewed daily. But note well: The misologists—the haters of logic—use logic to demonstrate the futility of using logic. The anti-intellectuals construct intricate intellectual arguments to prove the insufficiency of the intel-

lect. The anti-theologians use the revealed Word of God to show that there can be no revealed Word of God—or that if there could, it would remain impenetrable darkness and Mystery to our finite minds.

Nonsense Has Come

Is it any wonder that the world is grasping at straws—the straws of experientialism, mysticism and drugs? After all, if people are told that the Bible contains insoluble mysteries, then is not a flight into mysticism to be expected? On what grounds can it be condemned? Certainly not on logical grounds or Biblical grounds, if logic is futile and the Bible unintelligible. Moreover, if it cannot be condemned on logical or Biblical grounds, it cannot be condemned at all. If people are going to have a religion of the mysterious, they will not adopt Christianity. They will have a genuine mystery religion. “Those who call for Nonsense,” C.S. Lewis once wrote, “will find that it comes.” And that is precisely what has happened. The popularity of Eastern mysticism, of drugs, and of religious experience is the logical consequence of the irrationalism of the twentieth century. There can and will be no Christian revival—and no reconstruction of society—unless and until the irrationalism of the age is totally repudiated by Christians.

The Church Defenseless

Yet how shall they do it? The spokesmen for Christianity have been fatally infected with irrationalism. The seminaries, which annually train thousands of men to teach millions of Christians, are the finishing schools of irrationalism, completing the job begun by the government schools and colleges. Some of the pulpits of the most conservative churches (we are not speaking of the apostate churches) are occupied by graduates of the anti-theological schools. These products of

modern anti-theological education, when asked to give a reason for the hope that is in them, can generally respond with only the intellectual analogue of a shrug—a mumble about Mystery. They have not grasped—and therefore cannot teach those for whom they are responsible—the first truth: “And ye shall know the truth.” Many, in fact, explicitly deny it, saying that, at best, we possess only “pointers” to the truth, or something “similar” to the truth, a mere analogy. Is the impotence of the Christian Church a puzzle? Is the fascination with pentecostalism and faith healing among members of conservative churches an enigma? Not when one understands the sort of studied nonsense that is purveyed in the name of God in the seminaries.

The Trinity Foundation

The creators of The Trinity Foundation firmly believe that theology is too important to be left to the licensed theologians—the graduates of the schools of theology. They have created The Trinity Foundation for the express purpose of teaching the faithful all that the Scriptures contain—not warmed over, baptized, secular philosophies. Each member of the board of directors of The Trinity Foundation has signed this oath: “I believe that the Bible alone and the Bible in its entirety is the Word of God and, therefore, inerrant in the autographs. I believe that the system of truth presented in the Bible is best summarized in the Westminster Confession of Faith. So help me God.”

The ministry of The Trinity Foundation is the presentation of the system of truth taught in Scripture as clearly and as completely as possible. We do not regard obscurity as a virtue, nor confusion as a sign of spirituality. Confusion, like all error, is sin, and teaching that confusion is all that Christians can hope for is doubly sin.

The presentation of the truth of Scripture necessarily

involves the rejection of error. The Foundation has exposed and will continue to expose the irrationalism of the twentieth century, whether its current spokesman be an existentialist philosopher or a professed Reformed theologian. We oppose anti-intellectualism, whether it be espoused by a neo-orthodox theologian or a fundamentalist evangelist. We reject misology, whether it be on the lips of a neo-evangelical or those of a Roman Catholic charismatic. To each error we bring the brilliant light of Scripture, proving all things, and holding fast to that which is true.

The Primacy of Theory

The ministry of The Trinity Foundation is not a “practical” ministry. If you are a pastor, we will not enlighten you on how to organize an ecumenical prayer meeting in your community or how to double church attendance in a year. If you are a homemaker, you will have to read elsewhere to find out how to become a total woman. If you are a businessman, we will not tell you how to develop a social conscience. The professing church is drowning in such “practical” advice.

The Trinity Foundation is unapologetically theoretical in its outlook, believing that theory without practice is dead, and that practice without theory is blind. The trouble with the professing church is not primarily in its practice, but in its theory. Christians do not know, and many do not even care to know, the doctrines of Scripture. Doctrine is intellectual, and Christians are generally anti-intellectual. Doctrine is ivory tower philosophy, and they scorn ivory towers. The ivory tower, however, is the control tower of a civilization. It is a fundamental, theoretical mistake of the practical men to think that they can be merely practical, for practice is always the practice of some theory. The relationship between theory and practice is the relationship between cause and effect. If a person believes correct theory, his practice will tend to be correct. The practice

of contemporary Christians is immoral because it is the practice of false theories. It is a major theoretical mistake of the practical men to think that they can ignore the ivory towers of the philosophers and theologians as irrelevant to their lives. Every action that the "practical" men take is governed by the thinking that has occurred in some ivory tower—whether that tower be the British Museum, the Academy, a home in Basel, Switzerland, or a tent in Israel.

In Understanding Be Men

It is the first duty of the Christian to understand correct theory—correct doctrine—and thereby implement correct practice. This order—first theory, then practice—is both logical and Biblical. It is, for example, exhibited in Paul's epistle to the Romans, in which he spends the first eleven chapters expounding theory and the last five discussing practice. The contemporary teachers of Christians have not only reversed the order, they have inverted the Pauline emphasis on theory and practice. The virtually complete failure of the teachers of the professing church to instruct the faithful in correct doctrine is the cause of the misconduct and cultural impotence of Christians. The Church's lack of power is the result of its lack of truth. The Gospel is the power of God, not religious experience or personal relationship. The Church has no power because it has abandoned the Gospel, the good news, for a religion of experientialism. Twentieth century American Christians are children carried about by every wind of doctrine, not knowing what they believe, or even if they believe anything for certain.

The chief purpose of The Trinity Foundation is to counteract the irrationalism of the age and to expose the errors of the teachers of the church. Our emphasis—on the Bible as the sole source of truth, on the primacy of the intellect, on the supreme importance of correct doctrine, and on the necessity for systematic and logical thinking—is almost unique in

Christendom. To the extent that the church survives—and she will survive and flourish—it will be because of her increasing acceptance of these basic ideas and their logical implications.

We believe that the Trinity Foundation is filling a vacuum in Christendom. We are saying that Christianity is intellectually defensible—that, in fact, it is the only intellectually defensible system of thought. We are saying that God has made the wisdom of this world—whether that wisdom be called science, religion, philosophy, or common sense—foolishness. We are appealing to all Christians who have not conceded defeat in the intellectual battle with the world to join us in our efforts to raise a standard to which all men of sound mind can repair.

The love of truth, of God's Word, has all but disappeared in our time. We are committed to and pray for a great instauration. But though we may not see this reformation of Christendom in our lifetimes, we believe it is our duty to present the whole counsel of God because Christ has commanded it. The results of our teaching are in God's hands, not ours. Whatever those results, His Word is never taught in vain, but always accomplishes the result that He intended it to accomplish. Professor Gordon H. Clark has stated our view well:

There have been times in the history of God's people, for example, in the days of Jeremiah, when refreshing grace and widespread revival were not to be expected; the time was one of chastisement. If this twentieth century is of a similar nature, individual Christians here and there can find comfort and strength in a study of God's Word. But if God has decreed happier days for us and if we may expect a world-shaking and genuine spiritual awakening, then it is the author's belief that a zeal for souls, however necessary, is not the sufficient condition. Have there not been devout saints in every age, numerous enough to carry on a revival? Twelve such persons are plenty. What distinguishes the arid ages from the period of the Reformation, when nations were moved as they had not

been since Paul preached in Ephesus, Corinth, and Rome, is the latter's fullness of knowledge of God's Word. To echo an early Reformation thought, when the ploughman and the garage attendant know the Bible as well as the theologian does, and know it better than some contemporary theologians, then the desired awakening shall have already occurred.

In addition to publishing books, of which *First Corinthians* is the twenty-ninth, the Foundation publishes a bimonthly newsletter, *The Trinity Review*. Subscriptions to *The Review* are free; please write to the address below to become a subscriber. If you would like further information or would like to join us in our work, please let us know.

The Trinity Foundation is a non-profit foundation tax-exempt under section 501 (c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. You can help us disseminate the Word of God through your tax-deductible contributions to the Foundation.

And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life.

John W. Robbins
President

Intellectual Ammunition

The Trinity Foundation is committed to the reconstruction of philosophy and theology along Biblical lines. We regard God's command to bring all our thoughts into conformity with Christ very seriously, and the books listed below are designed to accomplish that goal. They are written with two subordinate purposes: (1) to demolish all secular claims to knowledge; and (2) to build a system of truth based upon the Bible alone.

Works of Philosophy

Behaviorism and Christianity, Gordon H. Clark \$5.95

Behaviorism is a critique of both secular and religious behaviorists. It includes chapters on John Watson, Edgar S. Singer Jr., Gilbert Ryle, B.F. Skinner, and Donald MacKay. Clark's refutation of behaviorism and his argument for a Christian doctrine of man are unanswerable.

A Christian Philosophy of Education, Gordon H. Clark \$8.95

The first edition of this book was published in 1946. It sparked the contemporary interest in Christian schools. Dr. Clark has thoroughly revised and updated it, and it is needed now more than ever. Its chapters include: The Need for a World-View, The Christian

World-View, The Alternative to Christian Theism, Neutrality, Ethics, The Christian Philosophy of Education, Academic Matters, Kindergarten to University. Three appendices are included as well: The Relationship of Public Education to Christianity, A Protestant World-View, and Art and the Gospel.

A Christian View of Men and Things, Gordon H. Clark \$9.95

No other book achieves what *A Christian View* does: the presentation of Christianity as it applies to history, politics, ethics, science, religion, and epistemology. Clark's command of both worldly philosophy and Scripture is evident on every page, and the result is a breathtaking and invigorating challenge to the wisdom of this world.

Clark Speaks From The Grave, Gordon H. Clark \$8.95

Dr. Clark chides some of his critics for their failure to defend Christianity competently. *Clark Speaks* is a stimulating and illuminating discussion of the errors of contemporary apologists.

Education, Christianity, and the State \$7.95
J. Gresham Machen

Machen was one of the foremost educators, theologians, and defenders of Christianity in the twentieth century. The author of numerous scholarly books, Machen saw clearly that if Christianity is to survive and flourish, a system of Christian grade schools must be established. This collection of essays captures his thought on education over nearly three decades.

Gordon H. Clark: Personal Recollections, \$6.95
John W. Robbins, editor

Friends of Dr. Clark have written their recollections of the man. Contributors include family members, colleagues, students, and friends such as Harold Lindsell, Carl Henry, Ronald Nash, Dwight Zeller, and Mary Crumpacker. The book includes an extensive bibliography of Clark's work.

John Dewey, Gordon H. Clark \$2.00
America has not produced many philosophers, but John Dewey

has been extremely influential. Clark examines his philosophy of instrumentalism.

Logic, Gordon H. Clark \$8.95

Written as a textbook for Christian schools, *Logic* is another unique book from Clark's pen. His presentation of the laws of thought, which must be followed if Scripture is to be understood correctly, and which are found in Scripture itself, is both clear and thorough. *Logic* is an indispensable book for the thinking Christian.

The Philosophy of Science and Belief in God \$5.95
Gordon H. Clark

In opposing the contemporary idolatry of science, Clark analyzes three major aspects of science: the problem of motion, Newtonian science, and modern theories of physics. His conclusion is that science, while it may be useful, is always false; and he demonstrates its falsity in numerous ways. Since science is always false, it can offer no objection to the Bible and Christianity.

Religion, Reason and Revelation, Gordon H. Clark \$7.95

One of Clark's apologetical masterpieces, *Religion, Reason and Revelation* has been praised for the clarity of its thought and language. It includes chapters on *Is Christianity a Religion?* *Faith and Reason*, *Inspiration and Language*, *Revelation and Morality*, and *God and Evil*. It is must reading for all serious Christians.

Thales to Dewey: A History of Philosophy, paper \$11.95
Gordon H. Clark **hardback \$16.95**

This volume is the best one volume history of philosophy in English.

Three Types of Religious Philosophy, Gordon H. Clark \$6.95

In this book on apologetics, Clark examines empiricism, rationalism, dogmatism, and contemporary irrationalism, which does not rise to the level of philosophy. He offers a solution to the question: "How can Christianity be defended before the world?"

View Page 262

Works of Theology

The Atonement, Gordon H. Clark \$8.95

This is a major addition to Clark's multi-volume systematic theology. In The Atonement, Clark discusses the Covenants, the Virgin Birth and Incarnation, federal headship and representation, the relationship between God's sovereignty and justice, and much more. He analyzes traditional views of the Atonement and criticizes them in the light of Scripture alone.

The Biblical Doctrine of Man, Gordon H. Clark \$5.95

Is man soul and body or soul, spirit, and body? What is the image of God? Is Adam's sin imputed to his children? Is evolution true? Are men totally depraved? What is the heart? These are some of the questions discussed and answered from Scripture in this book.

Cornelius Van Til: The Man and The Myth John W. Robbins \$2.45

The actual teachings of this eminent Philadelphia theologian have been obscured by the myths that surround him. This book penetrates those myths and criticizes Van Til's surprisingly unorthodox views of God and the Bible.

Faith and Saving Faith, Gordon H. Clark \$6.95

The views of the Roman Catholic church, John Calvin, Thomas Manton, John Owen, Charles Hodge, and B.B. Warfield are discussed in this book. Is the object of faith a person or a proposition? Is faith more than belief? Is belief more than thinking with assent, as Augustine said? In a world chaotic with differing views of faith, Clark clearly explains the Biblical view of faith and saving faith.

God's Hammer: The Bible and Its Critics, Gordon H. Clark \$6.95

The starting point of Christianity, the doctrine on which all other doctrines depend, is "The Bible alone is the Word of God written, and therefore inerrant in the autographs." Over the centuries the opponents of Christianity, with Satanic shrewdness, have concentrated their attacks on the truthfulness and completeness

of the Bible. In the twentieth century the attack is not so much in the fields of history and archaeology as in philosophy. Clark's brilliant defense of the complete truthfulness of the Bible is captured in this collection of eleven major essays.

The Incarnation, Gordon H. Clark \$8.95

Who was Christ? The attack on the Incarnation in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has been vigorous, but the orthodox response has been lame. Clark reconstructs the doctrine of the Incarnation building upon and improving upon the Chalcedonian definition.

In Defense of Theology, Gordon H. Clark \$12.95

There are four groups to whom Clark addresses this book: the average Christians who are uninterested in theology, the atheists and agnostics, the religious experientialists, and the serious Christians. The vindication of the knowledge of God against the objections of three of these groups is the first step in theology.

The Johannine Logos, Gordon H. Clark \$5.95

Clark analyzes the relationship between Christ, who is the truth, and the Bible. He explains why John used the same word to refer to both Christ and his teaching. Chapters deal with the Prologue to John's Gospel, Logos and Rheemata, Truth, and Saving Faith.

Logical Criticisms of Textual Criticism, Gordon H. Clark \$8.25

In this critique of the science of textual criticism, Dr. Clark exposes the fallacious argumentation of the modern textual critics and defends the view that the early Christians knew better than the modern critics which manuscripts of the New Testament were more accurate.

Pat Robertson: A Warning to America, John W. Robbins \$6.95

The Protestant Reformation was based on the Biblical principle that the Bible is the only revelation from God, yet a growing religious movement, led by Pat Robertson, asserts that God speaks to them directly. This book addresses the serious issue of religious

fanaticism in America by examining the theological views of Pat Robertson.

Predestination, Gordon H. Clark \$7.95

Clark thoroughly discusses one of the most controversial and pervasive doctrines of the Bible: that God is, quite literally, Almighty. Free will, the origin of evil, God's omniscience, creation, and the new birth are all presented within a Scriptural framework. The objections of those who do not believe in the Almighty God are considered and refuted. This edition also contains the text of the booklet, Predestination in the Old Testament.

Scripture Twisting in the Seminaries, Part 1: Feminism \$5.95
John W. Robbins

An analysis of the views of three graduates of Westminster Seminary on the role of women in the church.

Today's Evangelism: Counterfeit or Genuine? \$5.95
Gordon H. Clark

Clark compares the methods and messages of today's evangelists with Scripture, and finds that Christianity is on the wane because the Gospel has been distorted or lost. This is an extremely useful and enlightening book.

The Trinity, Gordon H. Clark \$8.95

Apart from the doctrine of Scripture, no teaching of the Bible is more important than the doctrine of God. Clark's defense of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity is a principal portion of a major new work of Systematic Theology now in progress. There are chapters on the deity of Christ, Augustine, the incomprehensibility of God, Bavinck and Van Til, and the Holy Spirit, among others.

What Do Presbyterians Believe? Gordon H. Clark \$7.95

This classic introduction to Christian doctrine has been republished. It is the best commentary on the Westminster Confession of Faith that has ever been written.

Commentaries on the New Testament

Colossians, Gordon H. Clark \$6.95

Ephesians, Gordon H. Clark \$8.95

First and Second Thessalonians, Gordon H. Clark \$5.95

First Corinthians, Gordon H. Clark \$10.95

The Pastoral Epistles (I and II Timothy and Titus) \$9.95

Gordon H. Clark

All of Clark's commentaries are expository, not technical, and are written for the Christian layman. His purpose is to explain the text clearly and accurately so that the Word of God will be thoroughly known by every Christian. Revivals of Christianity come only through the spread of God's truth. The sound exposition of the Bible, through preaching and through commentaries on Scripture, is the only method of spreading that truth.

The Trinity Library

We will send you one copy of each of the 32 books listed above for the low price of \$150. The regular price of these books is \$235. Or you may order the books you want individually on the order blank on the next page. Because some of the books are in short supply, we must reserve the right to substitute others of equal or greater value in *The Trinity Library*.

Thank you for your attention. We hope to hear from you soon. This special offer expires June 30, 1993.

Order Form

Name _____

Address _____

Please: ☐ add my name to the mailing list for *The Trinity Review*. I understand that there is no charge for the *Review*.

☐ accept my tax deductible contribution of \$ _____ for the work of the Foundation.


☐ send me _____ copies of *First Corinthians*. I enclose as payment \$ _____.

☐ send me the Trinity Library of 32 books. I enclose \$150 as full payment for it.

☐ send me the following books. I enclose full payment in the amount of \$ _____ for them.

Mail to: The Trinity Foundation
Post Office Box 700
Jefferson, MD 21755

Please add \$1.00 for postage on orders less than \$10. Thank you.
For quantity discounts, please write to the Foundation.



First Corinthians

Gordon H. Clark

Many Christians have not understood or heeded Paul's warnings about man-made philosophy, and they try to combine the wisdom of this world--psychology, philosophy, science, "common sense"—with the wisdom revealed by God in the Bible. The result is a mixture of truth and error that tends with time to become more and more error and less and less truth.

But in I Corinthians Paul makes clear that he does not speak or write the words of man's wisdom, but the words given by God himself. For this reason, this commentary on Paul's first letter to the church at Corinth is must reading for all Christians, especially those who are apt to be seduced by the wisdom of this world.



Dr. Gordon H. Clark is an internationally renowned philosopher, theologian, and educator; the author of more than forty books; and the former Chairman of the Department of Philosophy at Butler University. He died in April 1985.

The Trinity Foundation
Post Office Box 700
Jefferson, Maryland 21755